DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 372 978 SO 023 849

TITLE	The Humanities in the Schools. ACLS Occasion Paper, No. 20.
INSTITUTION	American Council of Learned Societies, New York, N.Y.
REPORT NO	ISSN-1041-536X
PUB DATE	93
NOTE	65p.; Papers presented at the Humanities in the Schools Conference (Los Angeles, CA, August 31-September 2, 1991).
AVAILABLE FROM	American Council of Learned Societies, 228 East 45th Street, New York, NY 10017-3398.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Consciousness Raising; Cultural Awareness; Cultural Interrelationships; Cultural Pluralism; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Humanities; *Humanities Instruction; Intellectual Development; *Public Education; Social Integration; Womens Studies

ABSTRACT

Designed to serve as a record of the initial public activity of the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) Program in Humanities Curriculum Development, this collection of three articles offers different perspectives on the humanities in the schools. In the first article, "The Humanities and Public Education," Stanley N. Katz discusses the need to determine how the humanities can increase the range of knowledge necessary to the intellectual development and social acculturation of young people from elementary through university education and how some of the new humanities research and teaching techniques can be made to work for school teachers. In the second article, "Cultural Equity," Henry Louis Gates, Jr. conveys the message that an equilibrium needs to be established between an untenable celebration of diversity and monochrome homogeneity. Although no guarantee exists, Gates proposes that the mistake would be not to try. A question and answer segment follows his paper. The final article, "The Women's Studies Movement," by Catherine R. Stimpson, describes women's studies as a pioneer in multicultural research, teaching, and governance in its exploration of divisive differences. A question and answer segment appears after the article. The agenda for the August 31-September 2, 1992 American Council of Learned Societies Conference as well as lists of speakers and advisory board members conclude the document. Attached to the main document is "ACLS Education Newsletter, volume 1, number 2, Summer 1993." It contains program site news from Cambridge-Brookline (Massachusetts), San Diego (California), Los Angeles (California), and Minneapolis (Minnesota) for the ACLS Program in Humanities Curriculum Development. (CK)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 372 978

THE HUMANITIES IN THE SCHOOLS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN **OTHER THAN PAPER COPY** HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

SANDRA FREDE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

American Council of Learned Societies

ACLS OCCASIONAL PAPER, No. 20

ISSN 1041-536X

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CO 223 H19

.3

© Copyright 1993
American Council of Learned Societies

The Humanities in the Schools

The Humanities and Public Education
Stanley N. Katz

Cultural Equity?
Henry Louis Gates, Jr.

The Women's Studies Movement
Catharine R. Stimpson

Conference Agenda and Participants

American Council of Learned Societies

ACLS OCCASIONAL PAPER, No. 20

This Occasional Paper is a record of the initial public activity of the ACLS Program in Humanities Curriculum Development, a program which is intended to support the teaching of the humanities in the public schools through a national network of school-district/university collaboratives. A workshop at each collaborative site involves teacher-representatives of approximately a dozen schools, two post-secondary fellows, and a university coordinator. Each workshop, as a unit, produces specific curricular materials embodying current methods and knowledge of the humanities in a form useful nationally. In addition, each teacher-fellow produces curricular materials particularly appropriate for her or his own school. The post-secondary fellows and the university workshop coordinator participate in the workshop's curricular materials development and develop mutually supportive relationships with the teacher-fellows and their schools that involve their active participation during the workshop year and for at least two or three years beyond.

The conference, "The Humanities in the Schools," held August 31-September 2, 1991, brought together teachers and post-secondary faculty from the four initial project sites: Cambridge-Brookline Harvard University; Minneapolis University of Minnesota; Los Angeles University of California, Los Angeles; and San Diego University of California, San Diego. The conference combined networking and orientation activities with opportunities for participants to further their acquaintance with crucial issues in the humanities. At the Huntington Library, Art Collections, and Botanical Gardens, the workshop participants heard from Henry Louis Gates, Jr., Ivan Karp, Stanley N. Katz, and Catharine R. Stimpson, each speaking to the issue of the humanities in the schools and each offering a different perspective on those issues. The presentations of Professors Gates, Katz, and Stimpson, together with excerpts from the question-and-answer periods that followed the presentations by Professors Gates and Stimpson, comprise this Occasional Paper. They appear here as they were originally presented, with only minor editorial changes made by the authors.

ACLS is grateful to the Huntington Library, Art Collections, and Botanical Gardens for its exquisite hospitality, and in particular to the President of the Huntington, Robert Allen Skotheim, and The Huntington's Director of Research, Robert C. Ritchie. Thanks are also due to the funders of the ACLS Elementary and Secondary School Teacher and Curriculum Development Project, the Pew Charitable Trusts, the DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund, and an anonymous donor; and those who have served on the project's Advisory Committee: Neil Anstead, Annette Chin, Angela Covert, Donna Dunlop, Larry Leverett, Edward J. Meade, Jr. (Chair), Richard Ohmann, Sandra Sanchez Purrington, Judith Renyi, Ellen Wert, and Eliot Wigginton.

The Humanities and Public Education

Stanley N. Katz
American Council of Learned Societies

This evening represents the beginning of the culmination of a dream I have had since assuming the presidency of ACLS six years ago.

Our organization is best known as a confederation of the national humanities and social science disciplinary societies in this country, a leading provider of post-doctoral research fellowships, the administrator of area studies and international faculty exchange programs, and the publisher of scholarly reference books. Since our founding in 1919 as the United States representative to the Union Internationale Académique, we have been one of the most important higher education organizations in the world, and the voice of the scholarly humanities community in this country. We must continue to serve these functions if there is to be a healthy and vital humanities and social sciences community.

But I think that we must do much more if ACLS is both to serve the interests of the humanities broadly construed, and if we are to receive the public support the humanities deserve. I have argued for the past six years that we must expand our efforts at both ends of the life cycle, paying more heed to the needs of out-of-school adults and, crucially, to children in primary and secondary schools—an area in which ACLS pioneered through the use of summer workshops for high school teachers in the 1960's. We have been expanding our concern for adults through work with the Federation of State Humanities Councils. And for several years we have tried to familiarize ourselves with the leading K-12 curricular reform efforts (an area in which I have personally been active for 30 years due to my commitment to the improvement of American history teaching in the schools).

It proved difficult, however, to develop a fundable K-12 project for an organization whose focus has been almost entirely post-doctoral research. Funders quite reasonably asked who we were to presume to enter the crowded world of pre-collegiate education, and I am deeply grateful to the Pew Charitable Trusts, the DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund, and our anonymous donor for their vote of confidence in this neophyte effort. As recently as 24 months ago I would not have believed that there would be an ACLS K-12 project during my tenure in office.

Since I have already confessed that I am a dreamer, let me

further confess that I view this project in which you have joined us as the beginning of an ACLS Education Office, which will focus our efforts on questions of education all across the life span, but especially on the K-16 years. Those of you who are professionals in elementary and secondary education will surely have noted the reluctance of those of us in "higher" education to attend systematically to questions of teaching and learning. The politics of higher education (for what I take to be the wrong reasons) are now forcing the colleges and universities rightly to take questions of education more seriously, so that it is now opportune for us to forge more lasting ties among educators of all kinds, and to share our experience, expertise, and wisdom.

You may be amused to hear that this point was made at my expense just two weeks ago. My son, Derek, a musician, has just married a wonderful young woman named Sally whom he met because she played the cello in his orchestra in Boston. Soon after they met, they realized that their fathers had been closest friends in high school and college many, many years ago. Sally's father, Mike Greenebaum, went on to a master's degree in teaching (and later an Ed.D.), and a career as a history teacher and elementary school principal in Amherst, Massachusetts. I went on to a Ph.D. in history and a career as a university teacher and academic administrator. Mike wrote a brief musical comedy telling the story of our intertwined family histories for the wedding reception. About the first years of our friendship, one of the characters crooned that, after college, "Stan went into college teaching and Mike went into education." Touché. Well, I think that he is right, and I'm now trying to make it up.

The underlying premise of the program in which we are engaged is that there is an unnecessary and counterproductive fracture within the teaching profession, between those who teach youngsters in the K through 12 years and those who teach grades 13 to 16. We should share the same concerns for the education of our students, although of course our strategies, techniques, and interim goals will frequently be quite different. I do not mean to trivialize important differences, among them the fact that for some post-secondary teachers the activity of teaching is subordinated to research, while for some pre-collegiate teachers the transfer of content-knowledge is less important than the maintenance of discipline. And so on. At least some of the time, nevertheless, we are all committed to conveying the most advanced and useful knowledge to our students. For those students we are very similar actors at different points in the educational process.

What happens educationally in the schools is important to post-secondary educators not only because pre-collegiate teachers prepare some of their students for us, but also because they have both experiential and theoretical knowledge about pedagogy (both teaching and learning) to impart to us, though we have seldom taken their expertise with sufficient seriousness. Conversely, the disciplinary professionals of the colleges and universities have subject matter expertise which is essential to school teachers. Both need to learn from each other, but until fairly recently there were few institutional mechanisms for the sharing of knowledge and experience across the high school-college crevasse. It is now, happily, trite to say so, but such sharing has to be carefully structured so that no one is condescended to. There are many examples of mutually beneficial processes, ranging from both discipline- and university-based high school-college alliances through the efforts of innovative colleges of education to joint efforts in particular fields (such as geography, mathematics, and classics).

When my colleagues and I began to plan a national education project, we surveyed the 52 learned societies which comprise ACLS to determine what they were doing with respect to K-12 education in their fields. We were gratified to discover that all of the large societies and several of the smaller ones (19 in all) had significant pre-collegiate programs. Most were also actively attempting to recruit school teachers to their professional meetings and other activities. This convinced us that the process of transmitting disciplinary knowledge was being attended to by the several fields, but left us with the sense that something needed to be done to move this process to center stage and national attention, especially in the fields of humanistic knowledge.

Ironically, however, "humanities" is not a term much used in our schools, although humanistic subjects such as literature, classics, language, philosophy, and history all appear at various points in K-12 curricula. There is no professional category of pre-collegiate humanities education, either in the education schools or in school systems, although, for better or worse, "social studies" (though not "social science") has a recognized place in training and in the schools. It seems odd that our curricula should have taken the humanities so much for granted as not to label them pedagogically. Categorical recognition is not the aim of the ACLS project, but we would like to see more attention paid to the humanities in the schools. Not so much more time, for we recognize that there are only so many hours in a teaching day, but more thoughtful consideration of the educational function and relevance of the subjects

which comprise the humanities, and more adequate presentation of humanistic ideas and materials.

This is particularly true at a time when the humanities fields are among the most exciting to undergraduate students. The humanities work extremely well pedagogically, forming the core of liberal education, and they could work much better than they currently do in the schools. At least one of the aims of elementary and secondary education, after all, is to provide a common core of liberal education for youngsters in a democratic society, but the nature of an appropriate liberal education in the schools has not received much attention since the days of John Dewey.

It is not just that more "up-to-date" humanities knowledge should be conveyed (though no high school teacher would aspire to teach the "old" math or outdated physics), but rather that the intellectual and pedagogical centrality of the humanities is as applicable to schools as to colleges. College humanities teachers cannot tell school teachers how to enhance the humanistic content of their curricula, but they can work with them to make it happen. That is the philosophy behind this ACLS project.

There is no easy way to define the humanities. The legislation which created the National Endowment for the Humanities in 1965 simply listed the obvious fields, among them philosophy, literature, music, history, political science, anthropology, and so forth. The belated 1982 Congressional charter of the ACLS said only that we are responsible for the humanities and the humanistic aspects of the social sciences. Neither document specifies the arts as aspects of humane knowledge and creativity, but surely they must be included. One can say, negatively, that the fields of the humanities are those which study human experience, past and present, by means other than those of precise measurement. As Justice Potter Stewart commented on pornography, we may not be able to define the humanities, but we know humanistic work when we see it.

This is not the moment for a learned lecture on classical humanism, or its revival in the 16th century, but most western and eastern cultures do have long traditions of the humanistic study of mankind—of thought, politics, artistic expression, and other types of behavior. At the end of the last century, in the higher education of Europe and the United States, the several types of humanistic knowledge were categorized into "fields" of knowledge as the newly emerging research universities rationalized their organization and the newly self-aware disciplines claimed professional status.

History, for instance, became a "department," with the Ph.D. in history as its certification and with the newly-formed American

Historical Association as its professional organization. And, likewise, philosophy, literature, and the other fields that now compromise the humanities divisions of our universities took on their modern form. There were and are divisions of opinion about allegiances—Is political science in the humanities or social sciences? Are political theorists social scientists or mathematical philosophers humanists? —but by and large the humanities departments of the university are those which study human activity from a non-behavioral perspective. And in any case there are close linkages between the normative and behavioral study of human life.

But the classical architecture has begun to crumble. After all, anything in our culture more than a century old is an antique. There are at least two new forces undermining the old foundations: the weakening of disciplinary boundaries and the popularity of new scholarly topics which cannot be defined in traditional disciplinary terms.

For more than a generation, scholarly work in the humanities has become simultaneously cross-disciplinary and multidisciplinary for the simple reason that scholars have become concerned with problems which cannot be easily solved in straightforward disciplinary terms. Let me use my own career as an example. I earned my Ph.D. in American History with a dissertation on 18th-century Anglo-American politics. Studying political behavior in colonial America, however, I soon began to focus on legal institutions, and realized that I needed to know some law in order to understand my subjects. So I went to law school for a year, but returned to teach both American colonial history and legal history in a history department. After a couple of years, however, I moved to a law school and extended my research to constitutional law, both contemporary and historical, still inquiring into why Americans structured their political institutions as they do.

In more recent years, I have begun to wonder why Americans created an "independent sector," neither government nor business, to accomplish important social tasks, and I have begun to work on the behavior of not-for-profit institutions. All along, I have had a special interest in religion and religious institutions. During the 30 years of my teaching career, I have trained undergraduates and graduate students in history, law, art, journalism, political science, and sociology.

What would you say is my field? I may have lost track, but I believe I belong to the American Historical Association, the Organization of American Historians, the American Studies Association, the Law and Society Association, the Selden Society, the Osgoode

Society, the Conference on Critical Legal Studies—and probably others. I have been president of the Organization of American Historians and the American Society for Legal History. I am surely basically an historian, but my research and teaching have been driven by my pedagogical, intellectual, and political interests rather than by the traditional job description of the "American historian."

The second anti-disciplinary pressure in academia is the tendency of scholars to define themselves by the problems they address rather than the techniques they use. I have mentioned my interest in the not-for-profit sector—there is already a small group of scholars who define themselves as specialists in philanthropy, but who were trained as sociologists, economists, or historians. Much more important are the rapidly emerging fields of African-American Studies and Women's Studies, and in general the movement toward cultural studies. These new interests put pressures on the classical departments and have led to the creation of numerous new programs in colleges and in universities. Partly as a matter of the inherent disciplinary conservatism of the humanities and partly due to very real economic constraints, relatively few new humanities departments have been formed, and we remain unclear about proper training in these new fields of interest. In the sciences, of course, the natural course has been to disaggregate old departments and even to create entirely new ones as research developments dictate the need.

But, of course, there are a great many other new forces making for change in the humanities. I'll try to suggest at least some of them this evening simply to give you a notion of the variety of activity and the sense of change.

Technology has had a dramatic impact. While I have made the point that humanists seldom employ precise measurement or large-scale computation, the computer revolution has had a range of dramatic effects on our work. Perhaps the most important is the creation of electronic databases for everything from bibliographical information (you can't use the information if you cannot locate it) to full-text databases.

I'll give just two examples of the latter type. One would be the two major legal databases (LEXIS and WestLaw) which contain all legal decisions and much other data (legislation, regulation) in full text, fully machine-searchable. Another type is the Dartmouth Dante project, which has entered into machine-readable form all of the commentaries on the *Divine Comedy*, or the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, which contains on a single CD-Rom all of the classical Greek texts written before 700 A.D. This means that the scholar at

her desk at home can summon up vast amounts of information, and manipulate them in ways it would have taken 100 19th-century scholars a century to accomplish. And note that this information is theoretically accessible on-line or on-disk anywhere in the country (or world), a radically democratic development when compared to the traditional scholarly advantage of those who worked in the universities with the largest libraries.

There are, of course, many other beneficial consequences of the electronic revolution (not the least of them the electronic library catalogue), but I particularly want to notice the capacity to communicate by computer. This links the scholar not only to the new electronic sources of information, wherever they may be, but also to other scholars by e-mail. I keep in touch with colleagues in Germany, England and Australia this way, and can exchange information with them cheaply and instantaneously.

Which leads me to the next new pressure: the internationalization of the scholarly community. This process began in earnest with the development of the jet aircraft, but it has been greatly stimulated by the ease of computer communication, the problem-orientation of research, and the end of the Cold War. The relevant scholarly community in all fields of the humanities is now an international community, and this has had an invigorating impact upon American scholarship, which for too long was dependent upon the beneficial impact of the remarkable group of European intellectual refugees whom the Nazis bequeathed to the United States. It is important to recognize that internationalization will continue to have a profound cultural impact upon the often parochial character of native American thinking, suggesting new approaches, themes and problems.

Another strong new pressure, less obviously beneficial than internationalization, is the dramatic increase in the specialization of humanities research and teaching. As the teaching profession exploded demographically in the 1960's, the combination of the large numbers of new graduate students doing dissertation research with the development of new research methodologies and interests produced a vast flow of scholarship, much of which was much more tightly focused than that of early generations of humanities scholars.

As with a microscope, the narrowing of the field of view can produce important discoveries, but it also tends to obscure the larger context. Perhaps more important, specialized scholars sometimes prefer to teach quite narrowly defined courses which undergraduate students have a hard time contextualizing. When it comes to transferring this specialized knowledge to the earlier years of

schooling, some sophisticated translation will be required. Conversely, exposure to the traditionally broader focus of pre-collegiate education may produce important pedagogical insights for university teachers.

Which brings us to perhaps the most heralded of the new pressures on humanities research and teaching: multiculturalism. Two and perhaps all three of the other speakers at this conference will discuss multiculturalism, so that I will mention only a few obvious points. The first is that humanists can no longer ignore the fact that the humanities have multiple traditions. Without confronting the problem of priority or superiority, we are everywhere reminded that there a great many traditions in the study of human thought and behavior—not just the Euro-American tradition and those of East Asia (the two most commonly taught and studied in the United States), but many, many others. Our students of other than European origin demand to know about their cultural roots, just as our faculty colleagues of other than European origin increasingly turn their scholarly mirrors on their own past. The result has been an explosion of interest in "foreign" cultures and a vast enrichment of the parameters of humanistic teaching and research in this country.

But the movement to multiculturalism has brought in its wake some serious difficulties. We have too few teachers trained in the less common languages and cultures, and too little in the way of source material for research. The racial, ethnic, and national enthusiasms, which frequently accompany multiculturalism, can lead to a new sort of xenophobia, introspection, and cultural antagonism. The historic politicization of the academy has been exacerbated by the newly invigorated cultural allegiances, and the intervention of partisan politics into the educational sphere has proved too tempting to resist. And yet most thoughtful people agree that the myth of American cultural homogeneity has lost whatever shred of intellectual plausibility it might have had earlier in this century. One of the principal challenges to the humanities is the clarification of pedagogically and intellectually responsible approaches to multiculturalism at all levels of education.

I want to mention one final development which has had a dramatic impact on the humanities in higher education, and that is its new inclusiveness. It is no exaggeration to say that, as recently as a generation ago, the humanities focused on old, elite (and largely Euro-American) cultural texts and problems. It was the case in every field, from music to philosophy. But now every aspect of human life seems suitable for serious humanistic study—all social classes, all the

areas of the world, all periods of time (including the present), and all activities. Needless to say, women and African-Americans in particular have become leading subjects of study, but so have the sorts of mundane activity which the concentration on "high" culture caused to be overlooked: work, birth and death, play, and anything else for which a text exists.

Corresponding to this subject-matter inclusiveness has been a remarkable expansion of the idea of the "text." Humanists now claim to be able to read non-literate texts of all kinds, from religious and secular ceremonies to culinary traditions. We "read" styles of dress, patterns of sexual behavior, sports, photographs, buildings, popular songs. And to do so we have developed a great variety of new research techniques, since the old modes of reading traditional literary texts do not work for our new universe of subjects. My feeling is that it is this new inclusiveness that best characterizes the modern humanities. What an exciting period it is! Take African-American Studies as an example. Just think of the significance of the discoveries by Skip Gates and others of a large body of literature created by African-American women, the use by Eugene Genovese of slave songs, the identification by Peter Wood of the persistence of West African languages in the colonial American South, or even the controversial assertions about slave plantation agricultural productivity by Stan Engerman and Bob Fogel. The field of American Studies is currently swept along by a focus on popular culture, with serious work on movies, radio programs, beauty contests, and ethnic patterns of behavior. I could continue the list almost indefinitely, but I know that the after-dinner speaker must control his enthusiasms.

I have spent so much time on the transformation of humanistic scholarship because I think it is immediately relevant to our common concerns with elementary and secondary education. Ironically, the fact that the humanities have never been institutionalized in the K-12 years may provide us with an opportunity to incorporate much of the new material and many of the novel approaches into the curricula of the schools. We do not have to fight the university departments, nor do we have to apologize for teaching subjects that students enjoy (always a somewhat suspect activity in the university).

What we need to do is to determine how the new (that is, the inclusive and innovative) humanities can be brought to bear to increase the range of knowledge necessary to the intellectual development (that is, their liberal education) and social acculturation of young Americans, and how some of the new humanities

research and teaching techniques can be made to work for school teachers. That is why the ACLS project is set up to be a collaboration between pre-collegiate and post-secondary teachers in a loosely-organized seminar setting. That is why we have asked some of the leading college and university teachers in the humanities to participate in our seminars. And that is why we must all work with our other colleagues in individual schools and school districts to work out not only new teaching materials and routines, but also strategies for establishing them in our largest school systems. What is at stake is bringing the best in humanities education to the largest number of young Americans in the most effective fashion.

It is important to say that we need not concede anything in arguing for the importance of humanities education for youngsters. Today's *New York Times* has an article reporting on a conference of economists convened to advise on how the United States can resume its economic growth. "Time and again," the reporter notes, "the economists stressed the importance of improving 'human capital,' meaning that a better-educated, better-trained work force can lift a nation's growth rate." The sub-headline is: "One consensus among the bickering: educate the work force."

I don't doubt that most of the conferees and most readers of the *Times* will interpret the article to mean that Americans must be taught to count and do science, and so they must. But they must also be taught to read with discrimination, reason in complicated ways, appreciate the arts, and distinguish values. These things they will learn primarily from the humanities, and they are not frills. To paraphrase George Santayana, we must not neglect the utility of apparently useless knowledge. The humanities are not only educationally useful; they are indispensable.

And so I close as I started. Tonight is indeed the culmination of my dream of an ACLS K-12 project, but it is also the beginning of a more important aspiration—that a continuing collaboration between the humanites teachers and scholars who comprise ACLS will have begun tonight, a collaboration whose beneficiary will be all of our children, and all of us.

By now you will have guessed that I am counting on you to make me an educator. It is my best opportunity to "be like Mike."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Cultural Equity?

Henry Louis Gates, Jr.
Harvard University

There was one school in Piedmont, West Virginia, the Appalachian village where I grew up, and little Brenda Kimmel was its princess, at least as far as I was concerned. *Brown v. the Board of Education* having been decided when I was four, in 1954, I in turn was scampering hard alongside her two years later in the newly integrated public schools of Mineral County, West Virginia; for I was a would-be little brown prince. Now, Brenda Kimmel was the obsession of my grade school and high school years. That girl ate books—went through them faster than anybody I knew before or had known, except my father. Brenda would sit in study hall in total concentration, twirling her hair and devouring page after page, and so at the age of 13 or thereabouts, practical man that I am, I started to read books too.

I had been reading books before then, mind you—lots of them, but pretty much only sports books. I read sports books in order to get close to my father and to my only brother, who is five years older than I am, whose mutual passion for sports created a bond that had excluded me. If I could not fully share in their passion for sports, at least I would know something about what they were talking about if I *read* about sports. So I did all my book reports in school on sports books. Books with such scholarly titles as *Basketball Bones* and *Last Second Shot*, books I could read in an hour. Of course, it wasn't just Brenda Kimmel's example that made me change. It was also Mrs. Iverson, my eighth grade English teacher, who finally rebelled.

"Those 'books' you are reporting on are fluff," she had declared. "You are forbidden from reporting on them any more!"

Fluff? How dare she call my books fluff? What was I supposed to read instead? She handed me a copy of *A Tale of Two Cities*.

"I could never read a book that thick," I told her. "How about another book?" "Read it," she said.

I stayed up most of the night reading that book, and I was sorry when I fell asleep and couldn't read any more. I went on to *Les Miserables*, the biographies about Einstein, then Albert Schweitzer—*Genius in the Jungle* by Joseph Gollomb. Schweitzer was a revelation. I wanted to learn to play organs and restore them just like Albert Schweitzer did. I wanted to walk past the church on

the day of Pentecost on my 13th birthday and decide to change my life, secure with the knowledge that I would help the world, and win the Nobel prize. After all, I always did have a deep sense of guilt—treating malaria in Africa would be a natural for me. I read a book called *My Sweet Charlie*, a tear-jerker about a black boy and a white girl who fall in love in the South. He gets lynched of course, or anyway something very tragic happens to him because of white racism, and it all comes to a melodramatic ending. I gave it to Brenda Kimmel, though somehow I don't think that she appreciated the plot. And then I read *The Agony and the Ecstasy*, completely enraptured by Irving Stone's divine kitsch. It was I who was carving the Carrara marble, molding it with my chisel like clay. Best of all, though, was the passage about Michelangelo making love with his mistress, early one afternoon. Especially the part about how he had come to her house unannounced, how she had answered the door "in her robe only", how she had opened it for him when he had kissed her, and how red her nipples had appeared against her tan body. I read that page so often, it turned a different color from all the other pages in the book. It was the first time I had been aroused by words on a page: a strange and magical experience. Only reluctantly did I return that book to the library.

On Saturdays I used to go to the library in the nearby town of Keyser, West Virginia, the county seat, checking out recordings of Shakespeare's plays, and listening to the records while I read the plays. I loved the sound of Richard Burton's voice, and the clomping of the horses in *MacBeth*. None of this, alas, impressed Brenda Kimmel. Not even when I told her about Bertrand Russell and the bicycle. It seems Russell was out riding his bicycle one day and decided on the 32nd turn that he no longer loved his wife; reasoned that it was only fair and honest to tell her this; and headed back to do so. Incredible! I read that passage almost as much as I read the one about Michelangelo's mistress. But where Brenda and I parted company, and where I parted company with just about everyone else in my school, was when it came to books about being black. Here I grew up in a kingdom all my own. I would read about the books in *Ebony* magazine and then go down to Red Bowl's newsstand and order them through a distributor. They were mostly Dell paperbacks, and I paid for them with money I got from selling bottles. Which meant spending a lot of time collecting bottles. The big Dell Authors became a reading list for me. I remember the color of the pages and the size of the print, the red and black covers. I would order other books by people I had heard of, even vaguely, and I would read those too. Getting a new book in at

Red Bowl's newsstand was almost as exciting as was smelling a new textbook on the first day of school, or the mimeographed handouts that we all got in grade school.

But now at the age of 14 I was addicted to black books, and I would read them at one sitting. I remember James Baldwin saying something about having the opportunity to feel human in Europe and wondering what he meant. He also said something about coming to terms with his blackness, high in the Alps in Switzerland, listening to Bessie Smith's blues recordings. I had not even heard of Bessie Smith. I wouldn't hear Bessie Smith's music until my sophomore year at Yale. But that was okay, because James Baldwin played Bessie for me.

Later that year I remember doing a book report for Mrs. Iverson on Dick Gregory's new autobiography, entitled *Nigger*, and the battle of wills that she and I had about her saying the title out loud. She flatly refused. I had said it first, but her awkwardness and embarrassment made the words sound dirty, even in my mouth. And we said "nigger" all the time at home. But most of all I remember the funny shade of crimson that Mrs. Iverson's face was when the crescendo of my oral presentation somehow culminated on that word "nigger." And I sat down to silence, part of me satisfied, part of me frightened, but all the time knowing that I had passed through some kind of gate. Unlike the bottles I had sold to Red Bowl's, I was non-returnable.

So that's how I came to the humanities. The substitution of the love of the text for would-be pleasures of the flesh. Fortunately, when I got older, I discovered to my great satisfaction that one could have both. And that, too, is how I came to learn about and understand what being a black person in a racist society was all about. And now (fantasy of fantasies!) I even write books—books about other books and books about being black. And more of us today—more women, more people of color—are writing and publishing books than ever before in the history of this country. A few weeks ago, incredibly, three black women—Alice Walker, Toni Morrison, and Terry McMillan—graced the Best Sellers list of *The New York Times*. This impulse, and the impulse that has brought us to this great library today, is part of what is variously known as the movement toward cultural diversity or multiculturalism, in the academy, from pre-K and elementary schools through high school and the university. And like the bottles I sold back to Red Bowl's, the American academy too is non-returnable—non-returnable to those thrilling days of yesteryear, when men were men, and men were white, and when writers and scholars were only white men.

Over the past decade the college curriculum has, of course, become a matter of vigorous political contestation, and perhaps that is not altogether a bad thing. As Amy Gutmann, the political theorist, has argued, "in a democracy, political disagreement is not something we should generally seek to avoid. Political controversies over our educational problems are a particularly important source of social progress because we have the potential for educating so many citizens." Certainly the last several years have provided an occasion for testing Gutmann's hypothesis. Proponents of curricular change and of retrenchment alike have had to marshal and clarify their arguments. It would no longer do to preach to the choir merely. Each have had the opportunity to pick holes in the other's arguments, and in honest moments of reflection to consider the legitimate objections raised by the other side. Academics came to realize that it would no longer do to talk solely among ourselves, and more Americans outside the academy were being brought into this conversation. The inhabitants of an Ivy Tower were reminded that the Ivy Tower was part of a larger society, and supported with increasingly scarce resources from that society. This, I think, was a good thing.

At the same time, however, the polarizing tendency of the debates could sometimes distort, as polemics almost always do, the very real issues at hand. As the literary critic Gayatri Spivak of Columbia writes, "Sometimes, even with the best of intentions, and in the name of convenience, an institutionalized double-standard tends to get established. One standard of preparation and testing for our own kind, and quite another for the rest of the world. Even as we join in the struggle to establish the institutional study of marginalities," she concludes, "we must still go on saying 'and yet'." In the same spirit, we are often a little too ready to let pass bad arguments for a good cause. What is a good cause? One that we believe in, of course. And these bad arguments among proponents of curricular reform often center around notions of representation, cultural equity, and self-esteem. So I want to discuss these pitfalls very briefly.

The first I call the representation fallacy. And this means quite simply that we should only study authors of color or women simply because of the changing demographics of the American population. And this, it seems to me, no matter how understandable the impulse for this might be, is wrongheaded. If blacks are ten percent of the population of Los Angeles, does that mean that the curriculum, too, should be ten percent black? If in North Dakota blacks make up one percent of the population, are North Dakotans justified to yield only

one percent of the curriculum to black texts, and one percent only? In short, the notion of direct social representation reflected in the curriculum, applied in a consistent way, would immediately lead to absurd and untenable results.

Hand in hand with this conflation of textual and political representation has been a suspension in my own field of literary or esthetic judgment: the inability to distinguish between texts that are good and texts that are not so good—all in the name of a dubious multiculturalism. How did this come about? "Taste is not an index of morality," Ruskin once wrote, "taste is morality." Today we have inverted Ruskin to insist that taste is immorality or, at least, that judgments of taste were an unsuitable activity to engage in while children were watching. Not that anyone ever stopped judging, of course; judgment simply entered into the circuits of gossip, something done furtively and on the sly.

In this respect Hannah Arendt wrote in a most illuminating way about taste judgment as a political faculty: "They do not compel in the sense in which demonstrable facts or truth proved by argument compel agreement. They share with political opinions as they are persuasive. The judging person, as Kant said quite beautifully, 'can only woo the consent of everyone else, in the hope of coming to an agreement with him, eventually'. Culture and politics belong together, because it is not knowledge or truth which is at stake, but rather judgment and decision—the judicious exchange of opinion about the sphere of public life and the common world, and the decision of what manner of action is to be taken in it, as well as how it is to look, and, fourth, what kinds of things are to appear in it."

The sort of conversation and contestation that normally surrounds literary and cultural assessments, however contingent they might be, can be a valuable part of teaching. All texts are not created equal, they never have been and they never will be. Once a text by, say, Alice Walker becomes essentialized as the eternal black feminine, this kind of conversation, however, can no longer take place, because then you are no longer debating the value of a work, but of a genus of person.

The notion of cultural equity proceeds by just such a personification, unfortunately. As people enjoy equal standing under the law, so, too, we argue, must works of culture. The problem, clearly, is that this proposition is unintelligible. It requires that we could measure literary works on a scale, and declare them equivalent by some magical metric. Today, pace Yeats, even the mediocre lack all conviction. For the Thoroughly Post-Modern Millies of our day,

nothing is easier than to attack the straw men of disinterest, neutrality, impartiality, detachment, objectivity, and the like. Nor is it difficult to demonstrate the way in which the humanities have from their very inception been riven by the social divisions of humanity, whether these be sexual, racial, ethnic, or class division.

And yet our terms of disapprobation, the accusations of bias that we level, seem inevitably to incorporate the very normative dimensions we seem to deny. After all, the concept of bias only has meaning in contrast to the ideal of disinterest. Absent this ideal, we can only contrast bias in favor of other biases, and make no appeal that transcends the localities of our discourse. "The oppressed have different purposes and wants from their oppressors," the philosopher Richard Rorty, observes, "but they do not have deeper insights into reality." Rather than seeking to lay bear underlying realities, therefore, we might see our task as the contra-position of different interests, different perspectives. But I don't think that we are therefore condemned to the more reductive forms of cognitive relativism, or what in my field are called "standpoint epistemologies." We often hide within them another appeal to the transcendental—often a magical notion of a group identity, say, of being a woman or a member of the black community, whose coherence may be vouchsafed by Plato, or vouchsafed by God, but never by the vagaries of history or lived experience.

And of course the same reductive forms of identity politics conduced to the self-esteem school of pedagogy, a view of education as a sort of twelve-step program to racial or gender self-recovery. The difficulty arises when the promotion of self-esteem is offered as a rationale, the primary rationale, for curricular reform. This is a mistake. As it happens, a significant amount of research has been conducted in educational psychology on the matter of self-esteem, and it turns out that the theory that self-esteem improves scholastic achievement has no empirical support. When Laotian students in California ace their SAT's, it isn't because the curriculum reinforces a rich sense of their complex Laotian cultural heritage.

This sort of dime store psychology is quite seductive, and it has been quite seductive to me. But, as I say, a lot of empirical research has been done on this matter, and there is simply no evidence to support the proposition that self-esteem is causally related to school achievement. What there is, is some evidence that school achievement is causally related to self-esteem. Perhaps it is also worth noting in the arena of public school education, that there is a danger of offering curricular change as a cheap fix for what may

be a very expensive problem. Because the truth is, curricular change in history or literature is irrelevant if a kid does not know how to read or write or add. And that is the real crisis in American education that we all face—a new generation of kids that is going to be functionally illiterate. Forty-four percent of the members of the African-American community cannot read the front page of their local newspaper with adequate comprehension. Faced with brutal facts like that one, all of our high flown rhetoric about the canon and cultural diversity and multiculturalism becomes staggeringly beside the point.

I say all of this as a sort of deflationary preface, because I think it is worth trying to keep ourselves honest as we continue to toil in the academic vineyards. Bad arguments may do for other people, but we can't afford them ourselves. I also think it is worth restoring more of a historical perspective on the project of curricular development. That the curriculum changes, has always been the case. If the curriculum didn't change—let's say Lynne Cheney, or anyone in this room, devised the perfect curriculum for all time and everybody, and everybody agreed on it—well, that would be truly an historical innovation. Sometimes it's not clear who's the young Turk and who's the traditionalist. These days the tendency to broaden our educational vistas is, of course, often called "multiculturalism," a sweet or bitter mouthful, depending upon your sympathies. To both its proponents and its antagonists, multiculturalism represents, either refreshingly or frighteningly, a radical departure. Like most claims for cultural novelty, however, this one is more than a little exaggerated. For both the challenges of cultural pluralism, and the varied forms of official resistance to it, go back to the very founding of this republic. In the universities today, it must be admitted, the challenge has taken on a peculiar inflection. But the underlying questions are time tested. What does it mean to be an American? Must academic inquiry be subordinated to the requirements of national identity? Should scholarship and education reflect our actual demographic diversity, or should they rather forge the communal identities that may not yet have been actually achieved? For answers you can, of course, turn to the latest diatribe on these subjects from George Will or Dinesh D'Souza or Roger Kimball. But, in fact, these questions have always occasioned lively disagreement among American educators. In 1917, William Henry Hulme decried what he called "the insidious introduction into our scholarly relations of the political propaganda of a wholly narrow, selfish, and vicious nationalism and false patriotism." His opponents were equally emphatic in their beliefs. "More and more

clearly," Fred Louis Pateen ventured in 1919, "it would seem now that the American soul, the American conception of democracy, Americanism, should be made prominent in our school curricula, as a guard against the rising spirit of experimental lawlessness." Sound familiar?

Given the political nature of the debate over education and the national interest, the conservative penchant of charging multiculturalists with politics is a bit perplexing. For conservative critics, to their credit, have never hesitated to provide a political defense of what they consider to be a traditional curriculum. The very future of the Republic, they argue, depends on the inculcation of proper civic virtue. What these virtues are, of course, is a matter of vehement dispute. But to speak of a curriculum untouched by political concern is to imagine, as no one can, that education takes place in a vacuum. It is because we have entrusted our schools with the fashioning of a democratic polity, that education has never been exempt from the kind of debate that marks every other aspect of American political life. And while I am sympathetic to what Robert Nisbet once dubbed the "academic dogma," the ideal of knowledge for its own sake, I also believe that truly humane learning, unblinkered by the constraints of narrow ethnocentrism, can't help but expand the limits of human understanding and social tolerance.

So those who fear that balkanization and social fragmentation lie this way have got it exactly backwards. Ours is a world that is already figured by nationality, ethnicity, race, class, and gender. And the only way to transcend those divisions, to forge for once in this country a civic culture that represents both difference and commonalties, is through education—an educational system that seeks to comprehend the full diversity of human culture.

Behind the hype and the high flown rhetoric is a pretty homely truth: there is no tolerance without respect, and there is no respect without knowledge. The historical architects of the university understood this very well. As Cardinal Newman wrote over a century ago, the university should promote what he called "the power of doing many things at once as one whole, of referring them severally to their true place in the universal system, of understanding their respective values and determining their mutual dependence."

In just this vein the critic Edward Said has recently suggested that "our model for academic freedom should therefore be the migrant or the traveler. For if in the real world outside the academy we must needs be ourselves, and only ourselves, inside the academy we should be able to discover and travel among other selves,

other identities, other varieties of the human adventure. But most essentially in this joint discovery of self and other, it is the role of the academy to transform what might be conflict or context or assertion into reconciliation, mutuality, recognition, creative interaction." That's why I want to resist the tendency to cast this debate in terms of the West versus the rest of us, for that is the very opposition that the pluralist wants to challenge. Pluralism sees cultures as forces, dynamic, interactive rather than the fixed properties of particular ethnic or gender movements. Thus the idea of a monolithic, homogeneous West itself comes into question. Nothing new here. Literary historians have pointed out that the very concept of so-called Western culture may date back only to the 18th century. But rather than mourning the loss of some putative ancestral purity, we can recognize what is valuable, resilient, even cohesive in the hybrid and variegated nature of our varied modernity.

Cultural pluralism is not, as we know, everyone's cup of tea. Prominent cultural nationalists like Allan Bloom or Leonard Jeffries correctly identify it as the enemy. These polemicists thrive on absolute partitions between civilization and barbarism, between black and white, between a thousand versions of us and them. But they are whistling in the wind. For whatever the outcome of the cultural war in the academy, the world we live in is multicultural already. Mixing and hybridity are the rule, not the exception.

As a student of African and African-American culture, of course, I've come to take this kind of cultural palimpsest for granted. Pluralism, the great American philosopher John Dewey insisted early in this century, is the greatest philosophical ideal of our time. But he recognized it was also the greatest problem of our times as well. How are we going to make the most of the new value we set on variety, difference, individuality? How are we going to realize their possibilities in every field and at the same time not sacrifice that plurality to the cooperation we need so much? It has the feel of a scholastic conundrum. How can we negotiate between the one and the many? Today the mindless celebration of difference has proven as untenable as that bygone model of monochrome homogeneity. If there is an equilibrium to be struck, there is no guarantee we will ever arrive at it. The worst mistake we can make, however, is not to try.

Question-and-Answer Period

Question: There is a degree of courage, personal courage, that you are asking for—someone to stand up and put forward this idea

that multiculturalism can be a cover for some of our errors.

Gates: I think that it has to be done. The question is, how should one go about doing it? I think that one builds up trust with one's colleagues so that one knows another through various contexts. And part of it means giving those you disagree with the benefit of the doubt. People should feel that they can stand up and draw distinctions and say, "Look, I have to admit that I am trained within a set of presuppositions, and that extending from those presuppositions, I find *Beloved* a masterpiece; I find *The Temple of My Familiar* a fiasco." That is a fair enough statement. And if someone responds to that in a polemical, political, nasty way, there is not very much we can do about it. But I think we can gain the trust of our colleagues, and say look, we are all in the same boat.

I think it is important that we understand. And if you disagree with me about *The Temple of My Familiar*, teach me—teach me another way of reading that makes *The Temple of My Familiar* a richer, esthetic statement than *Beloved*. It means put up or shut up. That's the way it has to be negotiated; it has to be give and take.

(One of the things I learned in England is you can say anything you want, as long as you make it into a question. "*The Temple of my Familiar* is a disaster, wouldn't you say?" I had many bloody noses before I learned that.)

We have to have this give and take, this dialogue. We have to do it, because at the beginning of this movement, there were too many silly things that were allowed to pass. And then we would go off among ourselves, and I would ask somebody, "Do you really think that what you said is true?" And they would say, "What? Are you crazy? Of course not, but we can't let them see this divided house." Frankly, I think we are cheating ourselves.

I said that we should identify our critical positions, but I want to enter a caveat on this score. Must I stand up and say, "as a black, Appalachian from Piedmont, West Virginia"? It always seemed to me that it is the things we can't disclose about our critical position, our esthetic position, which are the most revealing. And so even this gesture—by standing up and saying, "Well, as a Chicano heterosexual from New Mexico, I . . ."—I think that's finally unproductive.

I'm just trying to say that I'm not sure that categories by which we identify ourselves—particularly the broad categories, such as gender, class or race—really explain anything. They are totalizing categories, which tend to eliminate our specificity as human beings. I mean, I'm a middle-class African-American male. What does that mean? I know all kinds of upper middle-class African-American

males who think what I say is totally ridiculous.

Question: Are you saying that we should not try to integrate the academy?

Gates: I wasn't saying that we should not integrate the academy. I was saying that it is a bad argument to say that the curriculum of the American novel should be ten percent black because black people are ten percent of the population. They are two different things. And in fact, it is much easier to integrate the curriculum than it is this room. And often one is used as a political substitute for the other. And so you say, "For Christ's sake, you have Toni Morrison. What more do you want?" You see what I mean?

Last year at Yale, 17 courses in the English Department taught *Their Eyes Were Watching God*. Wonderful, but can't they find another black face? I mean when is diversity genuine and when is it another kind of reification of an author? When are we replicating the forms of oppression that we rail against? I, too, was inspired by people of color in the academy, and mentors. But I also was inspired by mentors who do not look like me, either by ethnicity, or by religion, or by gender, for that matter. And certainly by class. Anybody can be a role model for anybody.

But I also think that it is important for people who feel disenfranchised to see other disenfranchised people make it. Psychologically. I know it was for me. Just like it was important right after I read the books that I cited at the beginning of this talk—the summer of 1965 when I read James Baldwin, right after the Watts riots. (I've written about this.) James Baldwin changed my life, in one way. But no more than Charles Dickens did or Hugo did, in a different way. That's why I think that if I was asked to make a list of the most important things about my identity, I'm not sure that being black and being a male would be the first two things that come to my mind, though they would for some people. You know, it might be that I like John Coltrane or Mozart or it could be 10,000 other things. But the identity politics that we are all playing usually presupposes that the fact of one's gender and the fact of one's ethnicity are two of the most important aspects of our identity. And I'm not sure how that particularizes itself; I'm not sure how that manifests itself in one's real life decisions. Because I know all kind of black people who are not alike at all—other than the fact that they are in this broad, very shifting category that we call African-American.

I think that it is important to understand the political nature of the change in curriculum, and to understand the politics of demographics as they impinge upon the academy and upon the society outside. What we have allowed ourselves to do is to blur the distinction. You see, I think it is the weakest argument—an argument made by people who don't believe in their literature—to say "the best reason for you to teach my people's literature is because of our demographic representation in the population." If that's what you are going to lead off with, you have a weak hand. I mean, Toni Morrison stands up to anybody, so does Zora Neale Hurston. I don't have to pull punches. I don't have to engage in some kind of "mau-mauing" (as we used to call it) of my white colleagues to insist that they be put into the curriculum. Wole Soyinka has the Nobel prize. He is one of the greats of literature, from Nigeria. He is one of the great tragedians of this century. We don't have to use bad arguments to effect this kind of change.

What happens in terms of representation? You see, the pun is on the word representation: representation as a matter of demographics, representation as a matter of political leverage. You can't confuse it for the way one represents, say, an identity in a text. They mean very, very different things.

Question: Don't you think curricular reform is important?

Gates: When I talked about using curricular reform as a cheap solution to a very expensive problem, what I meant was that the problems of illiteracy are bound up with a larger problem of class differentiation in America. And the only way that they can be addressed is not by adding James Baldwin to the rhetoric reader, but by, say, a Marshall Plan for the city. Now really, if you believe that, I think that we can engage in all sorts of palliative activities, but the cure is fundamentally an economic and structural cure.

I mean, I think there are a few sets of problems. But the first is structural. Until we have an administration willing to address the structural problems systematically, through economic reform, job training, moving people out of the inner city. (Where, believe me, industry is not going to return in force, I don't care how many tax incentives people give. Look, if you were running IBM—think about it in your shower, you don't have to admit it in public— are you going to put your factory in some inner city? The answer is probably no.)

At the same time, however, I think that we have to insist that our people take responsibility insofar as possible for the choices in

their lives. You know, waiting for governmental liberation is a bit like waiting for Godot. And the level of the problem is that homicide is the leading cause of death for black males between 15 and 34. And the vast majority of those black men are killed by other black men. There is no white person who is making them do that—directly; we can say, indirectly, the system lets them do that. We have to insist that people start to make choices about what they do to each other and to their own bodies.

We can't blame the victim. I'm not trying to do that. But we have to insist upon social responsibility while we simultaneously insist upon governmental intervention of a meaningful nature. I think that our politicians—the politicians of the black community and the liberal politicians who support policies that directly affect the black community—really don't have a clue about how to solve the problem of the inner cities generally, and the problems facing black people and other people of color more specifically. And the reason is because the world has changed so dramatically since the passing of the last civil rights law.

I read Andrew Hacker's book, *Two Nations*, which is replete with charts and graphs. And here is the two nations metaphor—two nations, one black and one white. If I were a Latino I would wonder what happened to me—and that is really something problematic in our discourse about racism, one of many things. But the other thing that is often evaded is the fact that if you look at the statistics carefully, you realize that what's happened since 1968 is that the black community has split in two: that there is now the biggest middle class black community and the largest black underclass that we have ever had.

Under segregation, we all had a certain measure of equality—or inequality—before the law. So that our community had more of an organic connection than it can possibly have now, when the black middle class who lived on Sugar Hill in Harlem now lives in Scarsdale and New Rochelle. And the unity of black culture becomes commodified through symbols such as black talk, black walk, black art, black music. But listening to rap music, or wearing dreads, or wearing dashiki, or whatever it might be, in Brookline is a fundamentally different thing than doing the same procedure, adopting the same practice, in inner city Brooklyn.

Yet our language, our rhetoric, suggests that there is a unified black community. It is delusional. We have denied the category of class. And class does make a big difference. And it is self-deceiving of black middle class people not to admit that. It is not to leave behind the people in the inner city. I think it is our responsibility to

do something about it. But we won't get there by pretending that we are all the same.

The Women's Studies Movement

Catharine R. Stimpson
Rutgers University, New Brunswick

I want to thank the ACLS for asking me to be with you. It is the most beautiful backdrop against which I have ever spoken. I am more accustomed to blackboards and American flags and occasional ratty curtains. So if your eyes wander, and they will, I understand. I am also glad to be here because I can think of few more important projects than the project on which we're engaged, which is bringing us together as students, teachers, and humanists.

In July 1992, I was reading the Best Sellers list of *The New York Times Book Review*, that reliable guide to current relations between culture and a consumer economy. Out of the 15 hardcover fiction listings, three were by black women—Terry McMillan, Alice Walker, and Toni Morrison. Here, I thought—sitting in my Staten Island kitchen on a Sunday morning—here, I thought, is a sign, a tremendous and celebratory sign of cultural change. Today I want to talk about this change: the new strength of women, which does not hurt men, this new strength of women in all their diversity, in our culture in general and in the humanities in particular.

I will focus on the Women's Studies movement, at once heralded and much misunderstood. As we talk together, I will be aware of a paradox, for me and I hope for all of us: the humanities today are a scene of ferment and growth and excitement. We have more ideas than ever before about everything. We have more people talking about these ideas. Women's Studies is but one part of this ferment and growth and excitement. But the basic activities of the humanities—reading and writing and remembering and thinking—these basic activities in our democratic culture may be in some danger. We may be choosing to become a culture that prefers not to read, that prefers not to write, that prefers not to remember, and that prefers not to think. In part, because reading and writing and remembering and thinking are just too hard.

I will never forget first reading T.S. Eliot's *The Four Quartets* and that line, "Go, Go, Go said the bird: human kind Cannot bear too much reality." But fortunately, Women's Studies offers us a way to dissolve this paradox. Because simultaneously it asks us to change our culture, to make it a more generous and inclusive and accurate culture, and to deepen our capacity for reading, writing, remembering, and thinking. Women's Studies is at once dynamic and conservative. What then is this movement? I will warn you that

as I talk I will be more celebratory than self- critical, but this does not mean there is no criticism to make. And if I come to you in my Pollyanna mode, I also have a capacity for being Cassandra. But on this beautiful day in this setting, wouldn't you rather have Pollyanna than Cassandra?

For a number of reasons, the Women's Studies movement re-emerged in the 1960's. The reasons for this included a push for general education reform and a commitment to social justice and racial equality that generated a renewed commitment to gender equality. The 1960's were also a decade in which there was some worry about the dissipation of the talents of educated women. It was the decade in which women of all classes and races entered the public labor force. It was the decade of new technologies of reproduction, such as birth control, which helped to redefine women's sexuality and the relation of women's bodies to their minds. The 1960's was also the decade of the rebirth of feminism—a rebirth inseparable from the social and cultural changes I just mentioned in such truncated form.

Not coincidentally, the Women's Studies movement emerged at exactly the same time as the information society. In 1962, Fritz Machlup published his pioneering *The Production and Distribution of Knowledge in the United States*. In 1963, Betty Friedan published *The Feminine Mystique*. In 1972, the Japanese issued a white paper—*The Plan For Information Society, A National Goal Toward Year 2000*. In that same year, 1972, *Ms.* magazine went into action. In 1977, the American Library Association took up the question of libraries in an information society. In that same year, 1977, Elaine Showalter published *A Literature of Their Own* and Barbara K. Smith her influential essay, "Toward a Black Feminist Criticism." In 1982, John Naisbitt in *MegaTrends* told America that the most explosive shift of their lives was that from an industrial to an information society. In 1982, Carol Gilligan presented *In a Different Voice*, her greatly influential study of women and moral reasoning. So we have simultaneously in the 1960's deep social and cultural changes, the rebirth of feminism, and the birth of, or at least the naming of, the information society—all of which combined to help produce Women's Studies.

In the information society, education—the active acquisition of theories and concepts and empirical knowledge—matters, for survival and success. As one commentator writes bluntly: "Upward access through the social economic strata of this society is assumed to depend upon advanced education." Supporters of the struggle for Women's Studies want women to be full citizens of the information

society. And opponents of the struggle for Women's Studies do not. Though not everyone who cares about women's citizenship in the information society is a feminist, the necessity of educating women, at least narrowly, is a theme on which feminists and many non-feminists agree. Few people today believe that women are best barefoot, pregnant, and illiterate. However, feminists care passionately about Women's Studies and the education of women. Misogynists and the blindest of gender traditionalists have been right to fear the consequences of the education of women. "I think," reads a feminist button, "therefore I am dangerous." By the way, that button does not footnote Descartes—a sloppiness of scholarship that the buttonmaker ought to be sorry about.

Now let me speak for a moment about the relationship of Women's Studies to feminism. Self-consciously and imaginatively, contemporary feminism structured itself as a sweeping educational reform movement with five goals that applied to all the disciplines.

First, feminism would improve child-rearing and socialization practices. Next, feminism would organize small consciousness-raising groups, and in them women would learn from other women about their lives in order to change these lives. Next, feminism would attack the media—the studios that market lessons and images for a mass culture. Fourth, feminism would create cultural alternatives, a splendidly new art, literature, film, music, journalism, and religion. Finally, feminism would transform, or at least alter, the sites of formal education from child care to research centers. This explicit alliance between contemporary feminism and education which began in the mid-1960's has had its triumphs—so many that some now conclude that feminism has given way to post-feminism. One woman has written that feminists are beset by the fear that academe would declare premature victory for women in education, that students may believe that the crisis is past. She fears that feminists may seem like "feminine Deadheads, congregating periodically around a few aging leaders so as to hear a tired repetition of a few standard tunes left over from the late 1960's." But I want to assure you I am not going to burst into, "I am woman, hear me roar"!

The triumphs of the alliance between feminism and education have been genuine. They include the facts that most overt discrimination has disappeared, that there are laws on the books against discrimination, and that we are aware of the differences among women, especially racial differences and other important differences. The triumphs of the explicit alliance between feminism and education also include the fact that more women are entering colleges and universities: between 1980 and 1990, the number of

Native American women attending college increased 30 percent, of Asian-American women, 99 percent, of African-American women, 16 percent, of Hispanic women, 73 percent, and of white women, 15 percent.

Another triumph on which I wish to focus is this: women and gender, as subjects, have entered our public consciousness and the curriculum. And quantitatively the growth in research and teaching about women and gender is impressive. If it were a stock it would be booming. If Women's Studies were a capitalist enterprise, you should have bought one share in 1969, because you would be very rich now. In 1969 there were 16 or so courses in the United States devoted to the subject of women and gender. Today there are Women's Studies courses in over two-thirds of our universities, in over one-half of our four-year colleges, and in about one-fourth of our two-year institutions. All together, about 2,000 colleges and universities have some sort of a Women's Studies curriculum.

In 1970 at the American Philosophical Association's convention, none of the 100 papers was on race and gender. In 1990, 21 of 224 papers took up these issues. A 1990 survey of English departments showed that almost all of them still wanted students to learn the intellectual, historical, and biographical background needed to understand the literature of a period. But in addition, 61.7 percent hoped that students would grasp the influence of race, class, and gender on literature and on its interpretation. The three meetings that the United Nations Decade for Women sponsored helped to strengthen the global perception of the importance of Women's Studies. By 1990, there were at least 164 free-standing and university-based research centers that focused on women and gender: 66 in the United States and Canada, 29 in Asia, 25 in Europe and England, 23 in Mexico, Central America, and Latin America, eight in northern and sub-Saharan Africa, five in Australia and New Zealand, four in the Middle East, four in the Caribbean, and one brave research center on women and gender in Russia. And no matter how marginal, no matter how thinly financed, these achievements are in place. Indeed, one thing I hope for from this project is that the study of women and gender will become as important in primary and secondary education as it now is in post-secondary education. And I hope to see the teachers in this room, men and women alike, as prophets who help to bring the generous and serious study of women and gender into the curriculum of elementary and middle and secondary schools.

But what is it that Women's Studies offers? What does it offer the information society? What does it offer education? Let me talk

about two things. One is, quite frankly, a moral vision, a moral vision of a just and equitable educational community, a moral vision of educational communities in which we do have freedom of inquiry; in which there is access to learning for rich and middling and poor alike. This moral vision asks for mutual respect among all learners and for policies that serve all learners. If the moral vision of Women's Studies were to be incorporated in all our schools, we would have child care, for men and women alike. We would have freedom from racial and sexual harrassment. We would have democratic self-government, and we would have equitable hiring of all races and both genders.

But there is not simply a moral vision. A second good of Women's Studies is a rich and gusty and cross-disciplinary menu of ideas. Ideas about history, ideas about literature, ideas about society and culture, ideas about sex and gender—the connection between our theories of sex and gender and our theories of human nature—ideas about sexuality, about sexual difference, about difference itself. In these ideas of Women's Studies, there has also been the demonstration of how persistently we have mis-measured sexual difference by making the male the norm and the female a variant from the norm.

Do we all know about the famous Goldberg test showing how our notions of sexual difference distort our sense of culture and society? And how we make the male the norm? This is a grueling little test, and I feel slightly guilty bringing it to you on such a pretty day, but here was the test. There are two classrooms, both consisting of boys and girls—Classroom A and Classroom B. Classroom A and Classroom B were given the same essay to read. It was identical in title, it was identical in content, it was even identical in terms of spelling mistakes. There was one difference. Classroom A was told that the essay was by a boy, excuse me, a man. Classroom B was told that the essay was by a woman. You can imagine the result. Classroom A said, "Hey, this is good; this is strong; this is logical; this is intelligent. I've learned a lot from it." And Classroom B, their eyes drifting over the same page, except for the author's name, said, "This is illogical, this is silly, this is not worth reading." It is Women's Studies that again has tried to show us how embedded is our sense of sexual difference, how much this has given cultural authority to men and taken cultural authority away from women, and how on a conscious level this has influenced our judgments about the humanities, about culture, and about history.

The truths of other ideas of Women's Studies. The initial recipe for the menu of ideas in Women's Studies after World War II

was Simone de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex*, published in France in 1949 and translated into English in 1953. De Beauvoir has a lot to answer for, and *The Second Sex* is filled with horrendous mistakes. But what great work is not? If we threw out a work because it was in error, we would have nothing to read, not even the Holy Bible. But one of de Beauvoir's lasting contributions was to tell us to distinguish between "sex," a biological condition subject to some of the rules of nature, and "gender," a social construction subject to the rules of culture. De Beauvoir taught us to realize the humanly-made rules of culture that defined much of what we believe to be natural—our bodies for example.

Joan Scott, one of the crucial figures in Women's History, has said, "Gender is the social organization of sexual difference. But this does not mean that gender reflects or implements fixed and natural physical differences between women and men. But rather, gender is knowledge that establishes meanings for bodily differences." Historians in Women's Studies and in the new social history are demonstrating how culture has drawn the particular geography of sexuality and the body. For example, social historians and women's historians are now showing that modern heterosexuality and homosexuality did not spring from the eternal matrix of mother nature. But instead our notions of modern sexuality were made in the foundary of 19th-century culture. Again working with de Beauvoir's insistence that we could separate sex and gender, Women's Studies, particularly historians and anthropologists, began to trace how crucially societies vary from each other. All have biological women and all have biological men, but the meaning of being a woman differs radically from one society to another as the meaning of being a man differs radically from one society to another.

Every society has a gender system, but the meaning of these systems differs as radically from one society to another. Under the pressure of these perceptions, Women's Studies has taught itself not to speak of the universal woman, of an essential femaleness, and not to speak of a universal man (though some people in Women's Studies still speak too loosely of the patriarch). It has taught itself that to speak of a universal woman or a universal man is to commit the intellectual sin of essentialism.

Now, much of the energy of Women's Studies, building on variations on sex and gender systems, building on the need to conceptually divide sex and gender, much of the energy of Women's Studies has been spent in a gloomy fashion. Indeed, if you read much of Women's Studies material you will see a note of

anger, of irascibility, even of rage, shall we say—a grumpy quality that some find unattractive and others find inevitable. For much of the energy of Women's Studies has been spent showing how often our gender system has been hierarchical and how often our constructions of sexual differences have been synonymous with sexual discrimination. Economists have documented economic inequalities, political theory has documented the denial of citizenship to women, psychologists have documented the reasons why men batter and women submit, media critics have documented the demeaning and silly representations of women. And educationalists have documented the shortchanging of girls in primary and secondary schools, especially in science and mathematics classrooms.

But in the 1970's and 1980's, people in Women's Studies began to distrust the distrust of difference, when difference meant only discrimination. Women's Studies began to prize the female as well as to deplore dangerous differences between men and women. In the humanities scholars began to search not simply for women's absence but for women's presence. They began to search for women's culture, for women's literary and artistic traditions, and a new, free women's writing that would be the poetics of a newly freed body and psyche. In this search for a good difference let me mention two works that I think are crucial to the teaching of Women's Studies in the humanities. One is Annette Kolodny's work—her two books, *The Lay of the Land* and *The Land Before Her*, that document differences in the writings of men and women as they confronted the American continent

A second crucial work is, I think, Alice Walker's wonderful essay of 1974, "In Search of Our Mothers' Gardens," in which she drew on several traditions. She drew on Virginia Woolf's essay, "A Room of One's Own," she drew on Jean Toomer's wonderful novel, and she put them together to say black women have not been beasts of burden. They are creative and they have been creative in ways that make us celebrate. She talks about going South, to her mother's house, and seeing a garden that is more beautiful than it had to be to grow vegetables for the family dinner table. And she talked about seeing quilts that were more beautiful than they had to be to keep children warm at night. And she talked about listening to the stories her mother told her that were then translated into her novels and short stories.

Philosophy continues the search for good differences. Sara Ruddick began to elaborate the theory of maternal thinking—a picture of the cognitive and ethical behavior that arises from the practice of mothering. Among the best known figures who arose

during this period is a French writer, Helene Cixous, a creator of *écriture féminine* or women's writing, and Carol Gilligan herself.

In the 1970's, several other developments also emerged. Among them was Men's Studies—an elaboration, often despairing, even woeful, of the male or men's culture or the constuction of masculinity. Much more than the evocation of Iron John, I think Men's Studies has great intellectual potential. A second development of the 1970's was the creation of Gender Studies that showed how femininity and masculinity fit together like two huge Lego blocks to form a gender structure.

Now superficially, these two developments—the study of bad sexual differences and the study of good sexual differences—might seem contradictory. It might seem contradictory to conceptualize sexual differences as both destructive and constructive. But seen as a whole, women's experiences have been contradictory—full of conflicting conditions and clashing forces. To note but three: If we're teaching the family, we must often teach the family as the home plate of patriarchy. As you know, as both John Stuart Mill and Susan B. Anthony said, many men were willing to accept equality except in front of the fireplace. But the family has also been the place in which men and women have been companions against the hostile world.

A second contradiction: If many societies have devalued women and scorned them as creators and guardians of public organizations and culture, women have nevertheless created public organizations and created public culture. I think, for example, of the West African wall paintings that women create on mud walls or of Greek mourning songs, elegies that women sing.

The third contradiction is this: painfully, if many societies deprive women of power over themselves, women still have power to exercise. Women, though Other to men, have their Others too. In the United States white women *did* own black slaves of both sexes, and in Nazi Germany, as Claudia Koonz showed us in her heart-breaking book, *Mothers in the Fatherland*, Nazi women *did* brutalize and kill Jews of both sexes. And colonizers both lorded and ladied it over the colonized of both sexes.

In brief, Women's Studies learned that the picture of woman as total victim was as false as the picture of woman as total woman. The study of women in power shows what common sense alone should have shown: the historical and contemporary differences among women—race, class, sexuality, tribe, nationality, age, religion, and a host of other conditions. And so in the late 1970's, Women's Studies underwent a third intellectual development. If the

first was the study of bad differences, and the second the celebration of good differences, the third was the study of differences among women. My last point will be to explore this development and its consequences for us.

Women's Studies fissured into a number of groups, each of which fused the study of sex and gender with at least one other powerful element of biological, social, and cultural identity. Marxist feminist or socialist feminist thought in Women's Studies fused the study of gender with that of class. Lesbian studies fused the study of sexual preference with that of gender. Post-colonial studies, pioneered by Gayatri Spivak, fused the study of gender with that of the experience of colonization. Students of rural or urban women fused the study of gender with that of region. Feminists in religious studies fused very importantly the study of gender with that of religion and spirituality. And Black Women's Studies, Latina and Chicana Studies, Native American Women's Studies, and Asian-American Women's Studies fused the study of race and ethnicity with that of gender. Deborah McDowell, the black feminist critic and African-American literature scholar, suggested that what black feminist critics ought to do is to look at the specific language of black women's literature, describe the way in which black women writers have employed literary devices. Each of these groups drew on the whole repertoire of styles and theories available in the contemporary humanities.

What now do we do with these groups studying the differences among women? Obviously, each of these groups has several tasks. Each has to explore its own history, culture, social structure, and gender relations, and these are labyrinthian and demanding and intricate tasks. Cherrie Moraga, for example, talks about the difficulty of exploring and writing about her birthright of Chicana mother and Anglo father. Second, each of these groups must intellectually and morally confront its relations with other groups. We must ask ourselves how deeply relations of domination and dependence affect and infect relations among groups. Each group must excavate the errors it is prone to make about other groups.

But third and finally, it is time for each of these groups to enter into intellectual coalition with others. I think the time in Women's Studies and in the humanities as a whole has come for us to dwell not only with our differences, but with our unity. But we must not table our differences. On the contrary, in Women's Studies and in the humanities in general, we must continue to struggle against our bad differences and to celebrate the good. But it is time to realize that we sit at the same table. Women's Studies, having

begun to measure the differences among women honestly, can now begin to put our oils and vinegars together and to dress up our common interests. What I think it is time to do is, despite our suspicions and difficulties, to compose out of the turbulence of our differences big and renewing historical and social and philosophical narratives. "Dialogue and principled coalition," writes Patricia Hill Collins, "create possibilities for new versions of truth." Together, across and through and beyond our differences, we can reconstruct our classrooms. One source of unity can be the moral vision of education that Women's Studies offers and that I outlined earlier. If Women's Studies can fulfill this task, this living with our good differences and unities at once, it will deepen its experiment with educational democracy.

So what I suggest to you is this—Women's Studies in its exploration of divisive differences, its exploration of good differences, its exploration of differences among women has been our most seasoned and adventurous pioneer in multicultural research, teaching, and governance. I know of no other experiment in contemporary education that has confronted pluralism so openly and so honestly. If we are to survive well into the 21st century, we, this harming species, have much to do. We must educate a literate populace; we must feed, heal, and shelter us all; we must establish human rights; we must respect the ecology of earth and space. Women's Studies speaks to these issues. But I do not have to sit here just a few miles outside of Los Angeles and tell you that we must learn to live equitably in a multicultural, multiracial, multispecies world, and the humanities must construct our conversations for this world. Yes, Women's Studies has affirmed it will respond to this moral and political and intellectual imperative as well.

Thank you for listening to me. Let's have questions.

Question-and-Answer Period
[Note: Some questions were not recorded.]

Stimpson: I have been asked to comment on feminist bashing, which has been going on ever since there's been a women's movement. Formal feminism began in the United States in Seneca Falls in 1848. And you should read the press-bashing that went on in the 19th century. It's, interestingly, nearly similar to what is going on today. *The Herald Tribune*, for example, in an editorial written by Horace Greeley talks about, and I am quoting, "short-haired women and long-haired men," as if one's coiffure was a sure sign of

one's sexual peccadillos.

Why is it intensified today? I think for a couple of reasons. One is that feminism as a political movement and Women's Studies as an educational and intellectual movement have made mistakes. There's no way out of this. I know of no movement, educational or political, that hasn't made mistakes. Feminism has made mistakes and sometimes sent misleading messages. So that's that. We have to be honest about our errors, but more importantly and more deeply I think, we are a culture that looks for scapegoats, we practice a politics of division and a politics of us them.

I responded very strongly and positively when Clinton said he will not play the race card, and I think what we are seeing simultaneously is the playing of the race card and a playing of the gender card. It is a way of separating "nice" people with family values from not nice people who just happen to be the majority of us. We see a manipulation; gender is entered into the politics of divisiveness. Why should it do that? Why is it so easily adapted as a scapegoat? I think because the challenge of feminism and the challenge of Women's Studies, which includes feminists and non-feminists within the academy, is so broad. What we are asked to consider is not only our public life—the allocation of power and resources in our public life—but we are also asked to consider our personal life.

The way I put it is that feminism affects both the boardroom and the bedroom, and so it is a wide-spread questioning of tradition. And in the same way Women's Studies within the academy questions received knowledge. I happen to read white men, dead white men—my current idol is William James—but I must question how reputations are formed and how gender has played a part in forming education. Women's Studies asks us not only to consider received knowledge, it asks us to learn new things, to read new textbooks, and asks professors to rearrange their lecture notes. And in certain studies I've seen of people who are trying to mainstream Women's Studies, the resistance is not just to the material, it's to the idea of change itself. Women's Studies also asks us for a different kind of classroom, a classroom in which—I imagine nearly everybody here would find this sympathetic—in which the instructor is facilitator, rather than czar or czarina.

The challenge is very, very broad. One other reason that feminism has been a scapegoat is because it's been for gay and lesbian rights, and there are people who would go along with equal pay for equal work, and go into the corner and throw up at the idea of gay and lesbian rights. And I think that AIDS—not just in America, but AIDS globally—has made the championing of gay and

lesbian rights even more complicated. Interestingly, every public opinion poll shows majority support for feminist goals. So as humanists the question for us is this: What is this gap between the name and what the name represents? People, lots of people, call themselves feminists, but lots of people say, "Yes, I believe in equal pay for equal work. Yes, I believe in no sexual harrassment," but would rather call themselves all sorts of names than feminists.

We have a real gap, a real disconnection, between the signifier and signified, with people supporting the signified, but not the signifier. If I may speak like the literary critic I am, we've got a split sign, in which there is that gap between the signified, feminist principles, and the signifier, the word "feminist."

Question: What are the factors that would help a society evolve as a matriarchal or a patriarchal society?

Stimpson: As I answer, I want the historians and the anthropologists in the room to tell me if I could be off the wall, so I would like to have the answer to your question be a collective answer.

First, I think the terms matriarchal and patriarchal can no more be used universally than the terms female and male can be. A difficulty in Women's Studies is that it used the term "patriarchy" too loosely. And what we have to do, I believe—and here postmodernism has been enormously helpful for Women's Studies as have the factual contributions of history and anthropology—what we have to look at are specific societies and how they evolve over time, and at the relations of power within specific societies as they evolve over time. There has never been a matriarchy, although I think there have been societies that have worshipped women; and I am very taken by Elaine Pagels' work in the 1970's that talked about a turn that Christianity took, where it began to worship God the Father and repudiated certain Gnostic sects that were speaking simultaneously about God the Father and God the Mother.

Again, there have been societies where women have had a higher cultural role, a higher religious role, or a higher social role—often agricultural societies. And there are certainly societies such as our own where men have had much more power than women. But there is no such thing as a simple patriarchy. When we talk about male domination, we not only have to see how it works out in a specific time and in a specific place, but we also have to look at the whole complex of forces that are at work.

The work that historians have done in the United States on

slavery has been enormously important. And the conjunction of ethnic studies and Women's Studies has been enormously important, because it shows how questions of race and gender collide. Remember Frederick Douglass's autobiography? That little eight-year-old boy was first taught to read by his white mistress and was owned by a white woman and a white man. And then the white mistress stopped teaching him to read, because her husband told her to do so. She submitted to her husband, but that brilliant little boy had to submit to both of them.

But one book you might want to look at is *Woman's Role in Economic Development* by Ester Boserup. It came out in 1970. It started the study of women in the process of modernization. And she really began to look at what are some of the characteristics of modernizing society that tend to push women out of formal economic and cultural authority, and what you might expect when women do lose their place in productive forces. Now I have never been a Marxist, but I am not going to Marxist-bash; I am not going to submit to the currently fashionable trend of total Marxist-bashing. Marxist thought is very important by teaching us to focus on the place of productive forces as a source of cultural and social authority.

Question: Why are young women increasingly reluctant—or why do they seem increasingly reluctant—to identify themselves as feminists?

Stimpson: This is the so-called "post-feminist" phenomenon. How do I explain it? First let me tell you this story, and then I'll give you my amateurish pop psychologist explanation. I do not know how many of you were watching the "Today" show some years ago, when they were reporting about a study of students at Brown University, young women at Brown University, who refused to call themselves feminists. They said that feminism was passé. Jane Pauley, who was talking to a young woman from Brown, said to her at some point, "What would you like to be?" And this young woman looked at her and she said, "I'd like your job"! Well, Jane Pauley was very polite, it was 7:40 in the morning, she didn't want to upset anybody. She said, "Oh, and what else would you like to do?" And the young woman said, "Well, I think I'd like to have some children." So Jane Pauley said, "That's nice, it's nice to have children. And what else would you like to do?" And the young woman said, "Well I'd like to have your job, and then when I have my children, I'd like to take a year off and raise my children—

maybe two years—and then come back." And Jane Pauley finally lost it and she said, "You really think that NBC is going to hang around waiting for the likes of you?"

Now, what is the point of this story? The point is that that young woman from Brown—which you should know is not a gritty place like some of our community colleges and some of our four-year colleges and some of our public universities—this is a woman who had neither a sense of the past nor an accurate sense of the future. She did not know or would not learn the immediate past in which her assumption that she might become an anchor woman would have been silly. She did not know the immediate past where she could not have gone to certain law schools or medical schools. But she also did not sufficiently imagine the future in which the conflict between work and family life, between work and love, would be an issue.

I think what we have, at this particular moment of time, is a group of young women who are in a kind of blessed space where they have access, and they haven't hit the glass ceiling yet. And I look at them and in my nice mood I say "There, there, enjoy it. Take the keys to the car, there's gas in the tank, have a good time, I'll give you a credit card—you're going to get your own in a few years." And in my lousy, mean, belligerent mood I say to myself, "Get into a Woman's History class and shape up, kid."

But I think there are other explanations as well. We have had on a federal level, since 1980, 12 consistent years of bashing the feminists, and it really does take a toll. I think if Reagan and Bush had not been in the White House; if we had had as first ladies figures other than Nancy Reagan and Barbara Bush; if Nancy Reagan had said, "I am a feminist and I am still going to my office or to my pediatric practice," the national climate on that level would have been different. There would have been a different kind of vocabulary for young women and young men to feed into.

And another explanation: what we are seeing is a woman's version of the Oedipal Complex, and feminism is seen by some but not by all as their mother's thing. And not only their mother's thing but that mother who is kind of grumpy and bossy, etc., etc., etc. What I would love to do is come back in ten years and find out what you're hearing then.

Question: Where do the humanities play a role?

Stimpson: I speak of the humanities, as we in this room think of it, as a spacious enterprise, an inclusive humanities that does not

run away from aesthetic judgment, an inclusive history, an inclusive humanities. What is our responsibility as humanists? What is one of our most formal and most important responsibilities? We are the gatekeepers of the past. History is literally in our hands. We write the history books, we conduct the history classes, we either make the past a dead end or a living present. And I figure, again, we together as humanists, through making history alive, help people to avoid certain historical repetition compulsions.

Now will it work? Not altogether, no, not really. We are a forgetting species. But if we can teach history from pre-kindergarten and make history a life-long occupation, we can help people see that they don't only live in the present. And that there are patterns that we can break and that there are patterns that we can alter. So when I talk about Women's Studies putting together everything—instead of focusing only on differences among women—and writing a big historical narrative, I would like to see it in a book, I would like to see it in an audio-cassette, I would like to see it in a video-tape. I would like to have all of my students think of the past as a companion rather than as a distant stranger.

Question: One of the things I am really interested in is the notion that in the K-12 grade levels we don't have the specific Black Studies or Women's Studies programs, those sort of things generally. And I think one of the things you want to do is to infuse in the K-12 curriculum some of the multicultural aspects that are emphasized in those collegiate studies programs. But do you think that the move in teaching should be away from the specific studies programs at the college and university level to the mainstreaming sort of thing that is the model in the K-12 curriculum?

Stimpson: I was raised with a couple of very helpful slogans. One of them (and I couldn't understand it for years) is don't teach your grandmother how to suck eggs. And I would look at my grandmother making angel food cake by hand, whipping up the egg whites 600 or 700 times, and I would think what does that mean, "don't teach my grandmother how to suck eggs?" Well, I finally figured it out, and it means don't tell people who know more than you what to do. So I would not begin to prescribe the intellectual organization of pre-K through 12. I would need all of our thinking on that.

But you were also kind enough to ask me about the collegiate level. What do I think is appropriate? Obviously, if only for sur-

vival, but it is also intellectually necessary, the various ethnic studies programs and Women's Studies, which have studied the differences among us, have to come into intellectual coalition and pedagogical coalition, both for institutional survival and because it is intellectually correct. People have to start pulling together to give a spacious view of reality. But Women's Studies has developed willy nilly, at least on the post-secondary level or, as they say in Australia and New Zealand and England, on the tertiary level, a very good model of organization.

What it has is what I call four models of presence, four forms of education that work together simultaneously. One is the Women's Studies program, now often called the Gender Studies program, which is a separate interdisciplinary program which infuses knowledge about women and gender throughout the curriculum as the English Department is supposed to infuse specialized knowledge about writing. These programs are often marginally financed; they are often filled with the most tedious and unappetizing squabbles. But they are also often very good.

The second model of presence is work on women and gender within a discipline. This is probably the most common: Women in History courses, Women Writers courses, a Family course in the Sociology Department.

The third model of presence is the so-called mainstreaming project. And I think every institution on every level should be doing mainstream projects. Because I simply don't understand how any intellectually responsible school can go on without teaching about women and gender. This is not a trivial fad—we are talking about 50 percent plus of the population. And all of us, men and women alike, are influenced by gender. So to leave this out is like not teaching quantum mechanics in a physics course. It's like not teaching Plato in a philosophy course. When we teach women and gender, we are teaching a basic social literacy. And not to teach that literacy in all its complexity is simply educationally irresponsible. The resistance to mainstreaming is incredible.

The fourth model of presence is what's going on outside of the academy. Because some of the most important ideas in Women's Studies have not come from academicians. Virginia Woolf never went to university. And ideas come from poets, they come from conversation, they come from the air. But isn't that true of all of us in the humanities? The minute we cut off any single source of information, we're hurting ourselves. The minute we cut off any possible insight, any possible flash of beauty, we're hurting ourselves. The sure and final thing as humanists we're trying to do is to

keep our nerve ends continually open. And so Women's Studies in the fourth model of presence has tried to keep itself alive by brilliance and insights from outside the academy.

Question: How do young men feel about feminism?

Stimpson: It's complicated and it varies enormously. I've found no single model. I have, however, found that young men who have known women in the public labor force are all apt to be very sympathetic. Or young men with girlfriends—one of the first men I ever had in a Women's Studies course was there because his girlfriend told him to be. I think young men, who have seen women struggle and felt that they have been, in a loving way, a part of the struggle, try to be sympathetic. Young men who have good male mentors, young men who have had older men in their lives who have been capable of gender equity, are a step ahead. Working mothers is one pattern I see; the presence of strong and passionate male mentors is another pattern that I see. More and more I believe the crucial thing about human rights is human decency and character; that to me really education is about character, education is about teaching people to live generously and strongly and compassionately in the world. And for whatever reason, the nice guys are better on these issues—the nice guys, who are ethical and have a certain sexual self-confidence. What do I want to be protected from? A guy who is sexually insecure, who has been raised rigidly, often with a religious overlay to that rigidity, that's whom I get scared of.

Question: Why should there be separate Women's Studies departments?

Stimpson: I'm an agnostic. It really doesn't matter if you include experiences of men and women in all their diversity under a rubric of American experiences or urban literature or if you focus on women in literature or black literature. It doesn't matter. You're a mainstreamer and that's fine. We need all the models going at once.

Some people's weirdness is other people's normalcy. What I would go back to is my four models of presence and their interdependence. But I think there may be still, no matter how much mainstreaming there is, and I hope there is a lot of mainstreaming, a place for separate courses and separate departments, though how they will evolve is beyond my powers of prediction. Let me go back to the metaphor I used earlier. We want everybody to write, right?

We want everybody to read. We want every department to pay attention to language. We want everybody to speak well and eloquently and carefully. We want those language skills and literacy to be encouraged throughout our schools, right? But that doesn't mean we are going to do away with English Departments. We will still have an English Department—or so I, in a self-serving way, hope—we will still have an English Department as a specialized focus that can be a source of ideas. What I would like to see in your school is you doing exactly what you say you're doing, teaching a course in urban literature where you include a wide variety of authors, and I would love simultaneously to see someone in your school, male or female, teaching a course in women writers or gender in literature—and you could have terrific conversations.

Question: What do you think of black male academies and their implications for the education of women?

Stimpson: Let me give you my own experience first. Before I do that I want to speak directly and perhaps provocatively to the question of black male academies. I have seen the curricula plans for several of them and they scare me. Often they teach a kind of religious orthodoxy. I think they teach, at least in the curricula plans I saw, a pernicious form of Afrocentrism, and they teach gender stereotypes. So I have to put my cards on the table in terms of the black male academies and the curricula plans that I saw.

I do believe, however, that they are responding to a need. They are a bad response to a real and desperate need, which is the fact that as a culture we seem to be willing to write off the inner city. And if we continue doing this—and I speak as someone who lives in a city— if we continue to do this, there will be yet another reason to write American history as a tragedy.

But my own personal history is this. I went through the public schools—co-educational kindergarten, primary, junior, senior high school—and I lived with every gendered stereotype in the book. As well as with counter-messages. My schools were co-educational, they were public. And I am passionately devoted to the public schools. Another tragic error we will make as a country is to undercut the public schools. Then I went to a women's college. I went to what was then called one of the Seven Sisters, but which I now refer to as the Seven Hermaphrodites. I was a hick out of Bellingham High School in Bellingham, Washington. Eighty percent of my college class had gone to private schools. And I remember writing my grandfather saying, "Granddaddy, I've been to the library

and I've looked up 'irony,' I've looked up 'metaphor,' and I just have a lot of polishing to do." And there probably still is. And then I went to England where I went to a women's college at Cambridge University. And then I came back and dropped out for a while and then I went to Columbia University. Then I taught at Barnard College, which was a women's college and a part of Columbia University, and now I teach in a huge co-educational public research university.

What I have come away with from all that is, again, a commitment to diversity in education. I believe that we should have good public and private schools, though I don't believe in vouchers to private schools because I think that will probably encourage white-flight segregationist academies. Let there be three remaining male colleges and let there be 70 or 80 remaining women's colleges. We are a diverse country and a pluralistic country and I don't want my pluralism ever to be wiped out.

However, if we are going to go back and create male academies and female academies at the junior high school level, I would want to be pretty sure that our theory of human nature was right. And I'm not sure that we would be erecting those schools on a really accurate enough and deep enough theory of adolescent development. Carol Gilligan not only did write an influential book on moral reasoning, but, as many of you know, she is doing very intriguing studies on the development of adolescent girls. And she has now tapes, which she has made over a five-year period, where you see the girls between the ages of 10 and 15 increasingly denying what they know, and she has on tape these young women more and more using the form "I don't know." But Carol Gilligan's studies, wonderful and imaginative though they are, are they the base of a theory of adolescence deep enough and complicated enough to provide building blocks? Set up whole schools?

What I would prefer to see is this: let us practice our diversity within a single space, have teacher development programs, so that the teachers, male and female alike, learn not to give different cues to boys and girls and kids of different races. I would love to see us within one institution get a more inclusive curriculum. In other words, do it right together. And so if we have diversity now—because it's our historical legacy—terrific. This is 1992 and we are celebrating and deploring physical exploration. Physical exploration of the globe is largely over. We've gone over earth, we've settled everyplace. Our job now is psychic and social. That's the territory we have to conquer. Let us work with our diversity together within the same institution. So that's what I would prefer to have happen.

Question: What are some current issues in Women's Studies?

Stimpson: When I gave you my history of intellectual development of Women's Studies, I may have given you too much as it was, but I obviously left a lot out. For example, the quarrel about androgyny. And the quarrel about androgyny is, of course, the quarrel about human nature. I love Carolyn Heilbrun's book called *Toward a Recognition of Androgyny*. If I could toot my own bibliography I can say this, when I reviewed it I gave it all this praise, but her theory of androgyny still assumes that there is a fixed set of psychological qualities we can call masculine and a fixed set of psychological qualities we can call feminine. I don't believe in fixities of human nature beyond a certain point. The fixities I believe in: we are born, we seek, and we die. I believe there are cultural constructs. There is obviously a cultural construct called "masculinity" and a cultural construct called "femininity" and what that means varies from society to society. So when I hear someone say to a man "find the feminine within you," I know what that person is saying. And I would like to see males practice gentleness and compassion, and I would like to see women practice strength and boldness. But what I would really like is not to have that particular gender vocabulary, and in that way I am an equal opportunity ethicist. Our vocabulary of human nature has historically been in gender terms and that will continue as long as there are bodily differences. It is inevitable. It was inevitable when my brother and I took baths together that I would have a sense of his otherness. Neither of us were hermaphrodites. Because of our bodies, there is going to be built into every culture a sense of physical otherness. But we don't have to make a big cosmography out of this.

What I would like us to do is to recognize our difference, but have our description of human nature and of our individual temperament be complexes in which you say, "Yes, I was born into one sex or another. Yes, I was born into one race or another. Yes, I was born into one class or another. That is not the sum total of my being." In our encounters with the other—and again here is where the humanities matter so much—for we set the conversations on how to confront the other—be the other the past, or the other the present, or the other of our imagination, those encounters with the other always deal with a rich vocabulary. Part of the wonderful thing about the study of literature is that it enriches our vocabulary of the other. I would like to see us teach our students that the vocabulary of the other is potentially inexhaustible.

Question: Would you comment on ethnic and gender and racial relations in the urban environment?

Stimpson: I live in New York, what can I tell you? I not only live in New York, I live now in Staten Island, the most conservative borough, which is filled with racism. None of us is going to sit here and be unrealistic about ethnic and gender and racial relations. We know it is a desperate problem that is ours. And when I give my answers that I've gleaned in Women's Studies and what have you, they may seem like straws in the whirlwind, not straws in the wind, straws in the whirlwind. But they are the answers that I am capable of giving, and it seems to me again as humanists we could show in the classroom and in our dealings with each other, the possibility of another way. We have a tradition to call on. We do have a tradition of principled non-violence, and if in our teaching of history we can show alternate traditions that work, that's terrific. Always in our teaching we can show complexity and a need for multiple interpretations.

There is also art. I remember this summer sitting in a tiny little theater—one of the theaters in Joe Papp's Public Theater—watching an extraordinary performance, Anna Deavere Smith's "Crown Heights," where she acted out both Jews and blacks, and in her own body, in the body of the artist, she took on the conflict. And she gave us one of the traditional functions of art, which is representation, complexity, and catharsis. In our crude world, we may underestimate the importance of theater, the importance of the media, the importance of the humanities, in acting out the culprit in such a way that people don't want to do a bad thing themselves. The actor or the writer or the history teacher takes on a burden of serving as witness, acting a human pattern so that we understand it and then with luck remake it. I warned you that you were getting me in my Pollyanna mode. But if we in the humanities—and Women's Studies does this—if we don't present the possibility of a culture of hope, who is going to? Is that not one of our jobs in the humanities? In Women's Studies and in feminism as a political movement, you do see a culture of hope. Is not the nourishment of a culture of hope our job?

Note: Professor Stimpson's prepared remarks drew from some of her previous work on Women's Studies.

ACLS Conference on "The Humanities in the Schools"
The Huntington Library, Art Collections, and Botanical Gardens
August 31-September 2, 1991

Agenda

Monday, August 31

5:00 p.m. Registration

6:00 p.m. Tours of The Huntington with docents

5:30 p.m. Cocktails

6:30 p.m. Dinner

Welcomes by
Robert Allen Skotheim, President, The Huntington
Robert C. Ritchie, Keck Director of Research, The Huntington

Introduction by
Douglas Greenberg, Vice President, ACLS

"The Humanities and Public Education"
Stanley N. Katz
President, ACLS

Tuesday, September 1

9:00 a.m. Conference Schedule and Goals; Introductions

"Cultural Equity?"
Henry Louis Gates, Jr.
W. E. B. DuBois Professor of the Humanities, Harvard University

10:30 a.m. Coffee Break

11:00 a.m. Team Meetings

Tuesday, September 1 (cont'd)

12:30 p.m. Luncheon

"The Women's Studies Movement"
Catharine R. Stimpson
University Professor, Rutgers University, New Brunswick

2:00 p.m. Team and Inter-Team Meetings

4:00 p.m. New Learning Project Demonstration (optional)

5:00 p.m. Free Time and Optional Tours of Botanical Gardens

6:00 p.m. "The Humanities and Otherness"
Ivan Karp
The Smithsonian Institution

7:00 p.m. Cocktails

7:30 p.m. Dinner

Wednesday, September 2

9:00 a.m. Team Meetings

10:00 a.m. Coffee Break

10:30 a.m. Reports

noon Conclusion

ACLS Conference on "The Humanities in the Schools"
The Huntington Library, Art Collections, and Botanical Gardens
August 31-September 2, 1991

Speakers

Henry Louis Gates, Jr.
Afro-American Studies
Harvard University
1430 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138

Ivan Karp
Department of Anthropology
National Museum of Natural History
Smithsonian Institution
Washington, DC 20560

Stanley N. Katz
ACLS
228 East 45th Street
New York, NY 10017-3398

Catharine R. Stimpson
University Professor
Rutgers University
172 College Avenue
New Brunswick, NJ 08903

ACLS Advisory Board

Neil Anstead
Cleveland Humanities Magnet
8140 Vanalden Avenue
Reseda, CA 91335

Angela Covert
Atlantic Philanthropic Services
521 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10175

Douglas Greenberg
ACLS
228 East 45th Street
New York, NY 10017-3398

Larry Leverett
Division of Urban Education
Department of Education
Trenton, NJ 08625-0500

Edward J. Meade (Chair)
c/o AED
1200 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10011

Sandra Sanchez Purrington
Route 9, Box 80
Santa Fe, NM 87505

Catharine R. Stimpson
University Professor
Rutgers University
172 College Avenue
New Brunswick, NJ 08903

Ellen Wert
Pew Charitable Trusts
2005 Market Street, Suite 1700
Philadelphia, PA 19103-7017

Cambridge Brookline Site

The Workshop

Lawrence Aaronson
173A Rindge Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02140

Marcia Baynes
15 Banfield Avenue
Mattapan, MA 02120

Paul Fideler
575 Edmands Road
Framingham, MA 01701

Jacqueline Hallo
57 Babcock Street, #113
Brookline, MA 02146

Catherine Krupnick
Harvard Graduate School of Education
Longfellow 212
Cambridge, MA 02138

Linda Markell
60 Damien Road
Wellesley, MA 02181

Susan O'Brien
28 Preston Road
Somerville, MA 02143

Vito Perrone
Harvard Graduate School of Education
224 Longfellow Hall, Appian Way
Cambridge, MA 02138

Clare Fox Ringwall
695 Main Street
Acton, MA 01720

Robert Riordan
23 Donnell Street
Cambridge, MA 02138

Linda Wells
871 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, MA 02215

Richard Young
117 Beach Street
Quincy, MA 02170

The Public Schools of Brookline

Henry Bolter
The Public Schools of Brookline
Brookline, MA 02146

Jo Sullivan
The Public Schools of Brookline
Brookline, MA 02146

Cambridge Public Schools

Diane Tabor
Cambridge Public Schools
159 Thorndike Street
Cambridge, MA 02141

Los Angeles Site

The Workshop

Susan Anderson
725 S. Walnut
Brea, CA 92621

Marie Collins
1300 West 57th Street
San Pedro, CA 90731

Lynne Culp
13832 Haynes Street
Van Nuys, CA 91401

Lois Feuer
1317 First Street
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

Terry Henderson
233 N. Ridgewood Place
Los Angeles, CA 90004

Michael Lickson
850 South Genesee
Los Angeles, CA 90036

Sandra Okuta
1822 Purdue Avenue, #7
Los Angeles, CA 90025

Norma Rice
Center for the Study of Women
University of California, Los Angeles
405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Edward L. Rocklin
1414 Via Zurita
Claremont, CA 91711-2743

Karen Rowe
Department of English
University of California, Los Angeles
405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Beverly Tate
5240 Darby, #229
Simi Valley, CA 93063

Howard Wilf
5736 Jasmine Avenue, #212
Los Angeles, CA 90034

University of California, Los Angeles

Gayle Byock
Murphy Hall
University of California, Los Angeles
405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Raymund Paredes
Murphy Hall
University of California, Los Angeles
405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Los Angeles Educational Partnership

Peggy Funkhouser
Los Angeles Educational Partnership
315 West Ninth Street, Suite 1110
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Barbara Golding
Los Angeles Educational Partnership
315 West Ninth Street, Suite 1110
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Judy Johnson
Los Angeles Educational Partnership
315 West Ninth Street, Suite 1110
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Minneapolis Site

The Workshop

Marcia Eaton
Department of Philosophy
224 Church Street
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Michael Kennedy
7220 Cornelia Drive
Edina, MN 55435

Lyn Lacy
4309 42nd Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55406

John Ouellette-Howitz
212 Summit Avenue
Center City, MN 55012

John G. Ramsay
708 St. Olaf Avenue
Northfield, MN

David Rathbun
1967 James Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55105

Cynthia Rogers
225 Cecil Street South East
Minneapolis, MN 55408

Robin Stewart
3533 Pleasant Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55408

Minneapolis Public Schools

Mary Oberg
Minneapolis Public Schools
807 Northeast Broadway
Minneapolis, MN 55413-2398

Minneapolis Federation of Teachers

Skip Olson
Minneapolis Federation of Teachers
1300 Plymouth Avenue North
Minneapolis, MN 55411

San Diego Site

The Workshop

Katie Bence
Hearst Elementary School
6230 Del Cerro Boulevard
San Diego, CA 92120

Sandra Blackman
Marston Middle School
3799 Clairemont Drive
San Diego, CA 92117

Tom Carnes
Mann Middle School
4345 54th Street
San Diego, CA 92115

Crandallyn Graham
Morse High School
6905 Skyline Drive
San Diego, CA 92114

Steven Hahn
Department of History
University of California, San Diego
San Diego, CA 92093

JoEllen Harrison
Oak Park Elementary School
2600 54th Street
San Diego, CA 92105

Darlene Emily Hicks
4919 Felton Street, #1
San Diego, CA 92104

Lori Hughes
Angier Elementary School
8450 Hurlbut Street
San Diego, CA 92123

Eve Kornfeld
7802 Wingflight Court
San Diego, CA 92119

Robert Litchfield
Henry High School
6702 Wandermere Drive
San Diego, CA 92120

Staci Monreal
Zamorano Elementary School
2655 Casey Street
San Diego, CA 92139

Phyllis Newton
Central Elementary School
4063 Polk Avenue
San Diego, CA 92105

Mark Ryan
Clairemont High School
4150 Ute Drive
San Diego, CA 92117

Fane Wazny
Muirlands Middle School
1056 Nautilus Street
La Jolla, CA 92037

Donald Weedmark
Horton Elementary School
5050 Guymon Street
San Diego, CA 92102

San Diego City Schools

Lilia Barr
Horton Elementary School
5050 Guymon Street
San Diego, CA 92102

John R. Browne
San Diego City Schools
4100 Normal Street
San Diego, CA 92103

Carole Jewell
Horton Elementary School
5050 Guymon Street
San Diego, CA 92102

Will Lindwall
English Language Arts Specialist
San Diego City Schools
4100 Normal Street
San Diego, CA 92103

Frank Till
San Diego City Schools
4100 Normal Street
San Diego, CA 92103

Mark Wolfe
Social Studies Specialist
San Diego City Schools
4100 Normal Street
San Diego, CA 92103

University of California, San Diego

Stanley Chodorow
Arts and Sciences
University of California, San Diego
San Diego, CA 92093

Others

John Baugh
American Dialect Society
School of Education
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 994305—3096

William H. Becker
Economic History Association
Department of History
George Washington University
Washington, DC 20052

Donna Benedetti
American Philosophical Association
University of Delaware
Newark, DE 19716

Robert Blackey
American Historical Association
California State University
San Bernardino, CA 92407

Robert Cox
Linguistic Society of America
1325 18th Street, NW
Suite 211
Washington, DC 20036

Jonathan Friedlander
Middle East Studies Association
G.E. von Grunebaum Center for
Near Eastern Studies
10286 Bunche Hall
University of California, Los Angeles
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Milton McC. Gatch
Union Theological Seminary
9041 Broadway
New York, NY 10027

Raymond L. Handlan
Atlantic Philanthropic Service Co., Inc.
521 Fifth Avenue, 20th Floor
New York, NY 10175

Michael Holzman
Executive Associate
ACLS
228 East 45th Street
New York, NY 10017-3398

David Ivam
African Studies Association
University of California, Los Angeles
405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Anita Jones
Organization of American Historians
Indiana University
112 North Bryan Street
Bloomington, IN 47408

Timothy Light
Association for Asian Studies
Office of the President
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI 49008

Jane MacKillop
Southern Westchester BOCES
Valhalla, NY 10595

Stephanie McCurry
University of California, San Diego
San Diego, CA 92093

Kate Massey
1414 Via Zurita
Claremont, CA 91711-2743

Cynthia Rostankowski
American Society for Aesthetics
533 Johnson Avenue
Los Gatos, CA 95032

Mario J. Valdes
14045 Robarts Library
University of Toronto
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 1A1

Dennis Palmer Wolf
Project PACE
8 Story Street
Cambridge, MA 02138

59

ACLS Occasional Papers

1. *A Life of Learning* (1987 Charles Homer Haskins Lecture) by Carl E. Schorske
2. *Perplexing Dreams: Is There a Core Tradition in the Humanities?* by Roger Shattuck
3. *R.M. Lumiansky: Scholar, Teacher, Spokesman for the Humanities*
4. *A Life of Learning* (1988 Charles Homer Haskins Lecture) by John Hope Franklin
5. *Learned Societies and the Evolution of the Disciplines* by Saul B. Cohen, David Bromwich, and George W. Stocking, Jr.
6. *The Humanities in the University: Strategies for the 1990's* by W.R. Connor, Roderick S. French, J. Hillis Miller, Susan Resneck Parr, Merrill D. Peterson, and Margaret B. Wilkerson
7. *Speaking for the Humanities* by George Levine, Peter Brooks, Jonathan Culler, Marjorie Garber, E. Ann Kaplan, and Catharine R. Stimpson
8. *The Agenda for the Humanities and Higher Education for the 21st Century* by Stephen Graubard
9. *A Life of Learning* (1989 Charles Homer Haskins Lecture) by Judith N. Shklar
10. *Viewpoints: Excerpts from the ACLS Conference on The Humanities in the 1990's* by Peter Conn, Thomas Crow, Barbara Jeanne Fields, Ernest S. Frerichs, David Hollinger, Sabine MacCormack, Richard Rorty, and Catharine R. Stimpson
11. *National Task Force on Scholarship and the Public Humanities*
12. *A Life of Learning* (1990 Charles Homer Haskins Lecture) by Paul Oskar Kristeller
13. *The ACLS Comparative Constitutionalism Project: Final Report*
14. *Scholars and Research Libraries in the 21st Century*
15. *Culture's New Frontier: Staking a Common Ground* by Naomi F. Collins
16. *The Improvement of Teaching* by Derek Bok; responses by Sylvia Grider, Francis Oakley, and George Rupp
17. *A Life of Learning* (1991 Charles Homer Haskins Lecture) by Milton Babbitt
18. *Fellowships in the Humanities, 1983-1991* by Douglas Greenberg
19. *A Life of Learning* (1992 Charles Homer Haskins Lecture) by D.W. Meinig
20. *The Humanities in the Schools*

American Council of Learned Societies
228 East 45th Street, New York, NY 10017-3398

Non-Profit
Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Philadelphia, PA
Permit No. 999

JOHN J PATRICK ED 127NC
PROFESSOR AND DIRECTOR
SOCIAL STUDIES DEVELOPMENT CTR
2805 EAST TENTH ST
BLOOMINGTON IN 47405

ACLS

Education Newsletter

Volume 1, No. 2, Summer 1993

Project Update

Program Site News: Cambridge-Brookline

Vito Perrone, Director of Teacher Education at Harvard, is the facilitator of the ACLS workshop at *Harvard University*. During the 1992-93 workshop, the teacher-fellows completed the following projects: Lawrence Aaronson, "Mapping Across Time and Space: A Cross-Disciplinary, Multi-Cultural Humanities Project"; Marcia Baynes, "Nubia: A Resource for the Interdisciplinary Study of an African Civilization"; Jacqueline Hallo, "The Many Voices of the American Experience: The Progressive Period and the Harlem Renaissance"; Linda Markell, "The Evolution of Democracy and the Women's Movement in United States History"; Susan O'Brien, "American Identity and Contemporary Issues: Immigration, Civil Rights, and War"; Claire Fox Ringwall, "Reading as a Thinking Process: Strategies for the Classroom"; Robert Riordan, "Hands on, Heads Up: Approaching the Humanities in a Vocational-Technical High School Program"; and Richard Young, "Sixth Grade Social Studies Revision." The projects of the post-secondary fellows were: Paul Fideler, "Toward a Curriculum of Hope: The Essential Role of Humanities Scholarship in Public School Teaching"; and Linda Wells, "Moving to the Other Side of the Desk: Teachers' Stories of Self-Fashioning." ⌟

The ACLS Program in Humanities Curriculum Development is intended to support the teaching of the humanities in the public schools through a multi-dimensional effort centered on a national network of school-district/university collaboratives. A workshop at each collaborative site involves teacher-representatives of approximately a dozen schools and a university facilitator. Each workshop, as a unit, produces specific curricular materials embodying current methods and knowledge of the humanities in a form useful nationally. In addition, each teacher-fellow works with their school-based team to produce curricular materials particularly appropriate for her own school. The university workshop facilitator provides access to the university's intellectual resources and participates in the workshop's curricular materials development, developing mutually supportive relationships with the teacher-fellows and their school-based teams.

The project is now beginning its second year. There were four first-cycle (1992-1993) sites: Cambridge-Brookline *Harvard University*; Los Angeles *University of California, Los Angeles*; Minneapolis *University of Minnesota*; and San Diego *University of California, San Diego*. A fifth site has been added for the second-cycle (1993-94), consisting of representatives from the Boulder Valley, Cherry Creek, Denver, and Weld public schools. The workshop will be hosted by the *University of Colorado at Boulder*. In addition, the Cambridge-Brookline *Harvard University* workshop will continue for a second year. ⌟

Program Site News: San Diego

The workshop for the San Diego site was located at the *University of California, San Diego*. The workshop facilitator was Professor Steven Hahn of the Department of History. During 1992-93, the workshop participants completed the following projects: Katie Bence, "Cultures and Communities"; Sandra Blackman, Tom Carnes, and Fane Wazny, "Changes in Native American Identities as a Result of European Expansion, 1520-1850"; Crandallyn Graham, "Harlem Renaissance: Black Intellectual Construction"; JoEllen Harrison and Phyllis Newton, "Immigrants to San Diego, California, and the United States"; Lori Hughes, "Homes"; Robert Litchfield and Staci Monreal, "Families and Ancestors"; Fane Wazny, and Donald Weedmark, "Personal Identity, the First Border"; Steven Hahn, Emily Hicks, and Eve Kornfeld, "University

continued on page 4

Reflections

We have reached the end of the first year of the ACLS Elementary and Secondary Schools Teacher Curriculum Development project. The project had its origin in the conviction that the world of scholarship has changed enormously in this generation, that the subjects studied have changed, that the ways in which both new and old subjects are studied have changed, and that neither these methods nor these results are introduced in a systematic fashion into the elementary and secondary schools curriculum. (It goes without saying that this is also true in many places of the undergraduate curriculum.) As ACLS is an organization that gives fellowships, it was natural to approach this issue by thinking in terms of fellowships for individual teachers in elementary and secondary schools: ACLS would give them fellowships, they would study those new subjects and new methods, then they would compose curricula correspondingly.

And, indeed, this has happened. Thirty-four elementary and secondary school teachers have received ACLS fellowships, have studied the humanities for a year, and have composed curricula based on those studies. Much of this material is publishable; all of it is useful to the teachers in question and to their colleagues in their home schools. There has been a significant injection of contemporary scholarship into five school systems and, in addition, in those systems it is becoming known that there is more out there where that came from. And some of the teacher-fellows have gone further, and have developed systems for continuing this process of research-based curriculum development.

Quite early on we realized that in many cases the working conditions of elementary and secondary school teachers differ from those of undergraduate and post-graduate teachers in their degree of collegiality. The dominant cliché of the public schools, that a teacher can close her door and teach anything she wants, is really much more true of those teaching at other levels. Teachers in elementary and secondary schools are more constrained in what they teach, in what materials they use, and in how they teach, by and large, than their colleagues who teach undergraduates and graduate students. As is to be expected, in many cases these constraints are turned to some advantage, so that here and there what are now called "learning communities" have spontaneously come into existence in elementary and secondary schools. Perhaps the best known of these are those associated with the National Writing Project and, in Los Angeles, the Humanitas teacher network of the Los Angeles Educational Partnership. The ACLS project was designed to take advantage of such learning communities where they existed in particular schools, and to—gently—encourage their development in participating schools where they did not already exist. We have learned that the second order success of the project, the extent to which teachers associated with workshop participants benefited from the workshops, was dependent on the extent to which those teachers were associated with strong school-based learning communities. We are working with the districts associated with our 1993-94 workshops, and those associated with our 1992-93 workshops, to strengthen the organization of elementary and secondary schools into learning communities.

We have learned, from the testimony of teachers participating in the 1992-93 workshops, that one of their most valued effects was to bring teachers to identify themselves as scholars and researchers, without

write to Stanley Katz

ACLS

American Council of Learned Societies
228 East 45th Street
New York, NY 10017-3398
212 697-1505

The American Council of Learned Societies was founded in 1919. It is a private non-profit federation of fifty-three national scholarly organizations. The purpose of the Council, as set forth in its constitution, is "the advancement of humanistic studies in all fields of learning and the maintenance and strengthening of relations among the national societies devoted to such studies." The Council, consisting of a fifteen-member Board of Directors and one delegate from each of the constituent societies, meets annually.

This is the second issue of the **Education Newsletter** of the Council. It is to be published irregularly, to announce new sites and other matters of interest. It is distributed without charge to those on the ACLS mailing list.

losing their very strong self-characterizations as good teachers. Scholars teaching elementary school students are more likely to be in touch with a field of research, more likely to undertake research, more likely to create materials and utilize materials that others have created that are congruent with the findings of contemporary scholarship. This is, of course, also the case with those teaching secondary school students, undergraduates, and graduate students. This issue of identity, much emphasized by our San Diego workshop, is of immense potential importance. A schematic view of the American education system would present it as divided on this issue, with teachers of older students taking it as a matter of course that their own primary identity is that of scholar, and with teachers of younger students finding it taken as a matter of course that they are not commonly identified as scholars. Now, this is indeed simply a schematic; not everyone who teaches literature to undergraduates, say, subscribes to *PMLA*; there are some who teach young children who do read widely, some who publish prolifically. But the schematic is powerful enough to affect the organization of professional life in the schools. In most schools for younger students, much of the curriculum is decided by people who do not teach in those schools: school-site administrators, central office subject specialists, boards of education, state education departments, state legislative committees. In most schools for older students, the curriculum is controlled by those who teach it, either alone or in committees of their peers. It is not usually the case that the booklist for "English Literature, 1800-1900" at the state university is determined by the dean, provost, state commissioner for higher education.

It is generally considered that the quality of undergraduate and graduate education in this country are world benchmarks. It is possible that this is at least partially related to the organization of education in those spheres, where it is generally the responsibility of teachers whose working relationships are more like professionals in accounting firms, medical practices, law firms, than like workers in a factory or in a bureaucracy. It is not unlikely that the conditions of this type of organization have something to do with the scholarly prestige of the individuals and groups in question. As the ACLS constituent societies have developed, the claims of their members, individually and in departments, say, have counted for more in determining the shape of education in their schools. In the post-secondary realm, academic freedom is based on the authority of scholarship. It might then follow that the spread of academic freedom to schools charged with educating younger students will tend toward the reorganization—restructuring—of those institutions, with, it would be hoped, similar happy results for the students. If the ACLS efforts in matters of elementary and secondary education encourage this trend, they would certainly be worthwhile. ❑

Fellowship Opportunity: France

The American Council of Learned Societies and The Camargo Foundation will award one residential fellowship for a semester (either Fall or Spring) to a public secondary school teacher interested in pursuing a project in French language and culture.

The Camargo Foundation will provide, at no cost, a furnished apartment and the use of its reference library at its center in Cassis (either early September to mid-December or mid-January to May 31). Travel and other living expenses must be borne by the fellow.

The application deadline is March 15, 1994.

Application forms may be obtained from:

Office of Fellowships and Grants
ACLS
228 East 45th Street
New York, NY 10017-3398

In the administration of its fellowship and grant programs, the American Council of Learned Societies does not discriminate on the basis of age, color, creed, disability, gender, marital status, national origin, race, or sexual preference. Applications are particularly invited from women and members of minority groups. ❑

continued from page 1

Seminars and Lecture Series for Public School Teachers." Post-secondary fellow Eve Kornfeld wrote a paper entitled: "History and the Humanities: The Politics of Objectivity and the Promise of Subjectivity." ❑

Program Site News: Los Angeles

The Los Angeles workshop was located at the *University of California, Los Angeles*. Professor Karen Rowe, Department of English, was the workshop facilitator. During the 1992-93 workshop, the teacher-fellows completed the following projects: Susan Anderson, "Diary of a Mad Re-Visionist"; Marie Collins, "Pedagogical Implications for Transforming Curriculum"; and Anderson and Collins, "Team-Based Curriculum: The Emergence of the Chicano"; Lynne Culp, "A Year of Literacies" and "From Persuasion to Prejudice: A Study of Advertising, Propaganda, Images, and Stereotypes" (with Kathy Checchi); Terry Henderson, "Ghosts Among Us/ Ancestral Voices: An Interdisciplinary Unit on Storytelling"; Michael Jackson, "Gay and Lesbian Young Adult Database Project"; Sandra Okura, "The Anatomy of Creativity"; Beverly Tate, "Examining the Visual Text in Film"; and Howard Wilf, "Three Thematic Units: Jazz and Literature; Japanese Internment During WWII; *The Autobiography of Malcolm X* and Other Black Literature of the 1960's." The projects of the post-secondary fellows were: Lois Feuer, "Encountering the Other: Teaching the Bible in the Multicultural Curriculum," and Edward L. Rocklin, "Transforming Canons: Transforming Teachers." ❑

Program Site News: Minneapolis

The Minneapolis workshop was located at the *University of Minnesota*, where Professor Marcia Eaton, of the Philosophy Department, was the workshop facilitator. During the 1992-93 workshop, the teacher-fellows completed the following projects: Michael Kennedy, "An Ethnographic Study of a Second Grade Student"; Lyn Lacy, "Story Weavers: Participatory Storytelling of Folklore"; John Ouellette-Howitz, "Humanities Studies: A Multi-Cultural, Thematic Course"; David Rathbun, "Asian-American Literature"; Cynthia Rogers, "The Forum: Race and Gender Issues, A Middle School View"; and Rohn Stewart, "History, Culture and Art of Native American People." The project of John G. Ramsay, post-secondary fellow, was "Humanities Time Capsules." ❑

American Council of Learned Societies
228 East 45th Street
New York, NY 10017-3398
212 697-1505

ACLS

Non-Profit
Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Philadelphia, PA
Permit No. 999

JOHN J PATRICK ED 12782
PROFESSOR AND DIRECTOR
SOCIAL STUDIES DEVELOPMENT CTR
2805 EAST TENTH ST
BLOOMINGTON IN 47405